DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 242 EC 304 686

AUTHOR	Greyerbiehl, Dianne
TITLE	Educational Policies and Practices That Support the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in the General Education Classroom.
INSTITUTION	Quality Life Concepts, Inc.
SPONS AGENCY	West Virginia Developmental Disabilities Planning Council, Charleston.
PUB DATE	Oct 93
NOTE	111p.
AVAILABLE FROM	West Virginia Developmental Disabilities Planning Council, 1601 Kanawha Blvd. West, Suite 200, Charleston, WV 25312.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Change Strategies; Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; *Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; National Surveys; Program Implementation; Regular and Special Education Relationship; Resistance to Change; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS	Funding Formulas; *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

As a result of a 1992 West Virginia Department of Education plan to fully include students with disabilities, this project examined the effects of school funding practices and personnel practices such as certification, training, and teaching practices on the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular education classrooms. Information was gathered through national surveys of teachers and administrators and structured telephone interviews. Analysis of survey responses (N=185, of which 27 were from West Virginia) on special education funding formulas and financial incentives led to identification of six model states (Arkansas, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin), and interviews were conducted with five individuals in each state. Respondents frequently identified the following as barriers to inclusion: ineffective training procedures, beliefs and attitudes, rigid or ineffective policies and system processes, lack of teacher support, lack of funding and resources, poor leadership strategies, and poor communication. In-depth interviews identified the following key strategies for successful inclusion: (1) promote positive values and beliefs; (2) develop a philosophy and plan for inclusion; (3) provide training for inclusion; (4) provide sufficient support to general education classrooms; (5) utilize collaborative teaching strategies; and (6) establish site-based management teams. Research findings for funding practices and personnel practices are detailed for each question on the survey. Abstracts of state funding formulas and copies of survey and interview forms are appended. (Contains 19 references.) (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 393 242

Educational Policies and Practices that Support the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in the General Education Classroom

Dianne Greyerbiehl, Ph.D.
Quality Life Concepts, Inc.

October, 1993

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Heenan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Prepared for the
West Virginia Developmental Disabilities Planning Council
Charleston, West Virginia

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 304686

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
RESEARCH FINDINGS	
Funding Practices	1
Research Questions	1
Method	1
Overview	1
Funding Formulas	1
West Virginia's Funding Formula	3
Criteria for Effective Funding Initiatives	3
Analysis	5
Survey Results: Funding Practices	5
Incentives for Inclusion: Instate Programs	5
Disincentives for Inclusion: Instate Programs	11
Incentives for Inclusion: Residential Programs	13
Disincentives for Inclusion: Residential Programs	19
Factors Creating Incentives: Instate Programs	21
Factors Creating Incentives: Residential Programs	22
Impact of Inclusion on Students with Disabilities	23
Six Model States	24
Structured Telephone Interview	25
Ranking of Model States Criteria	25
A Capsule of the Model States	26
Model States' Recommendations	29
A Capsule of the State of West Virginia Now	30
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
Summary of Findings	31
Recommendations for Funding Practices in West Virginia	34
RESEARCH FINDINGS	
Personnel Practices	38
Research Questions	38
Method	38
Overview	38
Analysis	40
Survey Results: Personnel Practices	40
Certification Practices: Teacher Certification	40
Certification Practices: Administrator Certification	43
Preservice Education: Teacher Preservice	44
Preservice Education: Administrators Preservice	47
Preservice Education: Higher Education	50

Best Practices: Teaching Practices..... 50
Best Practices: Administrative Practices..... 52
Inservice Practices: Teacher..... 57
Inservice Practices: Administrator..... 59
Barriers to Inclusion..... 61
Five Model States..... 62
A Capsule of the Model States..... 62
Model States' Recommendations..... 65
A Capsule of WV Now and Its Personnel Practices For Inclusion..... 69

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 71
Findings..... 71
Recommendations for Personnel Practices in West Virginia..... 76

REFERENCES..... 79
APPENDIX A: Abstracts of State Funding Formulas
APPENDIX B: Survey and Interview Forms

Educational Policies and Practices that Support the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in the General Education Classroom

Dianne Greyerbiehl, Ph.D.
October, 1993

Executive Summary

In 1992 the West Virginia Department of Education published a plan for including students with disabilities within the regular classroom entitled, "West Virginia's Integrated Education Initiative". A statewide committee, made up of teachers, public school administrators and principals, parents, persons with a disability, advocates and representatives from higher education, developed the plan. The plan states that **all students have the right to receive equal educational opportunities and should be provided a quality education in age-appropriate integrated academic, social, physical and community settings.** With this document the school system leaped into the arena of one of the major controversies within education across the nation - the concept of full inclusion for students with disabilities into the regular classroom.

Much has been written about this topic, often with a great degree of high emotion either advocating for full inclusion, or indicating that it is a disservice to both students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers in the classroom (NASBE report, 1992; Davis, 1992; Stainback and Stainback, 1992; Sailor, 1991; Gartner and Lipsky, 1987; Brown, 1991). Despite the controversy, because of strong advocacy for inclusion from various sectors, state after state across the nation has begun to experiment with full inclusion of students with disabilities into the mainstream of neighborhood schools.

INCLUSION IS NOTHING LESS THAN A PARADIGM SHIFT IN HOW TEACHERS TEACH AND ADMINISTRATORS MANAGE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Although much has been written about inclusion, there has been little empirical description of the factors that support inclusion of students with disabilities to the benefit of all concerned (Salisbury, 1993). What little is known about successful approaches make it clear that **"inclusion" is nothing less than a major paradigm shift in how teachers teach and administrators manage schools (Skrtic, 1991; Stainback et al., 1992).** The new inclusive system of education is based on the needs of the *whole* student, not just merely academic achievement of the average student. It emphasizes individualization for all students; community and collaboration as the normal mode of teaching and interaction; and empowerment of school personnel, students and parents. For special education it means that students with disabilities are included in the general education classroom at their home school

with their age and grade peers. To the maximum extent

possible, included students with disabilities receive their in-school educational services in the regular classroom with appropriate in-class support (NASBE, 1992).

Project Purposes

Given the importance of inclusion for students with disabilities, and faced with the lack of objective information about best practices, the West Virginia Developmental Disabilities Planning Council contracted with Quality Life Concepts, Inc. (a nonprofit organization affiliated with the University of Maryland) to investigate funding and personnel practices in the public schools. The Council's interest stems from its charge to plan and advocate for services that assist people with developmental disabilities achieve independence, productivity and integration in their communities. Specific objectives for the project are:

1. To evaluate the effect of current school aid funding practices including funding formulas on the inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular classroom in West Virginia and across the nation, and

2. To evaluate the effect of personnel practices such as certification, training, and teaching practices on the inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular classroom in West Virginia and across the nation.

Overview of Findings

A. Barriers to Inclusion

Survey respondents from West Virginia and across the country most frequently identified the following as barriers to inclusion:

INEFFECTIVE TRAINING PROCEDURES such as ineffective training at the university level about inclusion, lack of training in collaborative teams, lack of knowledge about disability for general education teachers, separate inservice training for special and general education, lack of knowledge about how to adapt curriculums and individualize strategies.

BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES THAT ACT AS BARRIERS such as the belief that some children can't learn and that "special" students require "special" teachers, fear by general education teachers of disruption in the classroom, fear of slighting nondisabled students, fear of change and protection of turf.

RIGID OR INEFFECTIVE POLICIES AND SYSTEM PROCESSES such as certification processes, standardized testing, teacher evaluation system, rigid curriculum requirements, categorization of students by certain disability groupings, funding formula regulations, scheduling.

LACK OF TEACHER SUPPORT such as lack of teaching materials to support inclusion, too many teaching duties assigned, class sizes too large, no teacher aides for inclusive classrooms, no co-planning time.

LACK OF FUNDING AND RESOURCES such as budget cuts and limited money to hire teacher aides, buy needed materials or make facilities accessible.

POOR LEADERSHIP STRATEGIES such as state universities not providing leadership in inclusion, lack of vision, no clear plan or guidelines, lack of real knowledge about what is required for successful inclusion, authoritarian dictums, inclusion not really valued.

POOR COMMUNICATION such as lack of ongoing communication to solve problems and celebrate successes, ineffective communication about inclusion plan and its implementation to local schools, misunderstanding about what inclusion is by parents and teachers, lack of communication between general and special education.

B. Successful Inclusion Strategies

Indepth interviews with ten model states identified key strategies for successful inclusion, which are summarized below. It is recommended that these concepts be applied to efforts in West Virginia at state and local levels to include students with disabilities in regular education classrooms.

1. **Promote positive values and beliefs about students with disabilities.** Interviewees repeatedly talked about attitudes as the core to making inclusion work. The states where inclusion seemed to be the most successful offered a variety of ways for discussing attitudes and beliefs important to inclusion - such as the belief that all students can learn and have a basic right to inclusion. Specific strategies included inservice training, co-planning time for teachers, problem-solving groups, and an atmosphere of open communication generated by the building principal.

2. **Develop a philosophy and plan for inclusion that involves all stakeholders.** Interviewees emphasized the necessity of having and knowing about an overall state plan for inclusion that established core values, established broad desired outcomes for inclusion, and provided guidelines and criteria for measuring whether the outcomes had been accomplished. The overall plan provides a broad model for inclusion from which local schools could develop more specific goals for their particular community and its needs. Broad-based stakeholder groups, including parents, teachers, administrators, legislators, business and community leaders, need to be involved in the process.

3. **Provide training for inclusion.** Interviewees identified teacher skills as a critical elements to successful inclusion programs. All of the model states indicated that intensive initial training was provided. There was a universal complaint, however, that

state agencies did not provide adequate ongoing training that addressed new techniques and offered assistance with implementation problems as they arose. Most of the states also identified the need for greater involvement by higher education in preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms.

4. **Provide sufficient support to the general education classroom**. The interviewees identified the need for a variety of instructional strategies, including some that occur outside of the general education classroom. They emphasized, however, that serving a student with disabilities in the general classroom should be the first priority and that specialized instruction should be provided within its confines as much as possible. A range of support should be available to the regular classroom, including classroom aides, availability of specialist help when needed, reduced class size, provision of training for specific skill needs, a range of teaching materials for individualized instruction. It is also helpful to provide flexible funding that focuses on the individualized needs of students and special grants to pilot novel inclusion projects within specific schools.

5. **Utilize collaborative teaching strategies.** Interviewees frequently mentioned the importance of establishing teams of teachers from general and special education, in addition to specialized support personnel, to work together in a multidisciplinary fashion to provide for instructional needs within the regular classroom. In teams that were working well, some common elements were present: (1) intensive training on how to collaborate had been provided; (2) time for co-planning was provided;, and (3) collaborative training was valued by the school administrator and built into teacher evaluation processes.

6. **Establish site-based management teams or forums.** All model states had some type of local planning group at the building level that included the major stakeholders, particularly teachers, parents and building administrators. The groups were usually formed to do the initial planning, but many of the model states maintained some portion of the groups after planning was completed to focus on implementation. The groups provided forums for problem-solving and encouraged the operationalization of the values for inclusion into everyday terms and behaviors. The groups that were most effective made sure that teachers and parents alike were welcomed in the group.

RESEARCH FINDINGS
Funding Practices

Research Questions

1. What are the effects of West Virginia special education funding practices on inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular classroom?
2. What are the effects of special education funding practices on inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classrooms in other states in the nation?
3. What are the characteristics and effects of exemplary state funding practices?

Method

Overview

To answer these questions a survey was sent to the state director of special education in each of the 50 states. He/she was asked to (1) fill out the survey, and (2) distribute copies to 20 special education coordinators for their response. In West Virginia, the survey was also sent to 200 school principals. A 15% return rate was obtained. 185 individuals responded, 27 of those were from West Virginia - 15 special educators and 12 principals.

10 criteria for identifying effective special education funding practices were selected from data obtained from the survey, the NASBE report (1992), and feedback by experts in the field. From these criteria six model states were selected.

These same criteria were used to develop a structured telephone interview. The interview focused on obtaining indepth information about the operation of special education funding formulas and other financial initiatives within the six model states. At least five individuals in each state were interviewed; one at the state level and four at the local or area level. These individuals were distributed to include rural, urban and suburban locations.

Funding Formulas

For this project, special education funding formulas for all of the states were classified into six groupings, using a classification system developed by Moore, Walker and Holland (1982). A report of special education finance systems by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (1989) describes these groupings and provided a classification for each state based on their description.

Formula 1: Flat grant per students. *Under this type of funding formula, the State provides to each district a fixed amount of money for each student identified as needing special education services.*

Formula 2: Pupil weighting system. *Formulas pay districts a multiple of average per pupil costs or other base rate, depending on each student's disability type and/or program.*

Formula 3: Flat grant per classroom unit or teacher unit. *This formula provides each district a fixed amount of money for each special education teacher employed or for each classroom unit needed. Regulations often define pupil-teacher ratios or class size and caseload limits for the type of disability or type of program.*

Formula 4: Percentage of personnel salaries. *Provides districts with a percentage of the salaries of special education teachers and/or support personnel. The percentage may vary by personnel type. For example, the salaries of teachers may be reimbursed at a rate of 70% while salaries for aides may be reimbursed at a rate of only 30%. Pupil-teacher ratios are typical of this type of funding formula, in addition to the inclusion of minimum State salary schedules.*

Formula 5: Weighted teacher or classroom unit. *The State pays districts an amount based on a multiple of allowable teachers or classroom units. Weights may vary according to type of disability and/or program, and units are often constrained by pupil-staff ratios. For example, the State may fund one staff unit for each four students with severe disabilities and one staff unit for each 60 students who are speech and language impaired.*

Formula 6: Percentage cost or excess cost. *Reimburses districts for a percentage of the costs of educating students with disabilities. Reimbursement may be provided for a percentage of the full costs, or for the costs which are above the average per pupil costs for regular education programs. Costs usually must be in approved categories and fall within defined cost ceilings to be reimbursed.*

Formula 1: Flat Grant Per Student
Formula 2: Pupil Weighting System
Formula 3: Flat Grant Per Classroom or Teacher
Formula 4: Percentage of Personnel Salaries
Formula 5: Weighted Teacher or Classroom
Formula 6: Percentage Cost or Excess Cost

An abstract of each state's funding formula was obtained from the National Association of State Directors of Special Education . Each of the abstracts were sent to each of the states to be updated for FY 1992-1993. (See Appendix A for the abstracts). Using the updated abstracts, each state was classified under one of the six funding formulas. Each state indicated some special funding policies, in addition to the funding formula. Only the funding formula description was used to place the state within one of the six categories. One state, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia do not have funding formulas; instead they operate by a unique set of funding practices. The results for those states that have funding formulas can be seen on the next page. West Virginia fell under Formula 2.

West Virginia's Funding Formula

The State of West Virginia administers its State aid for special education as an integral part of its basic State formula, the West Virginia Basic Foundation Program. Through this program, the State provides support to school districts for salaries of professional educators and service personnel, fixed charges, pupil transportation, administrative costs, other current expenses, and improvement of instructional programs. Aid is provided to each school district in an inverse relationship to its ability to pay for public school programs.

The aid for salaries is based on the State's minimum salary schedule up to a ceiling of 53.5 professional staff per 1,000 students, and 34 service personnel per 1,000 students. For those purposes, all students are counted similarly except for exceptional education pupils (disabled and gifted) who are weighted by a factor of 3:1. This weighted count along with a weighted count for students in honors and advanced programs is used to adjust each county's enrollment. The adjusted enrollment is then used an one input in calculating the State aid formula. Funds, including those generated as a result of the weighting, become a part of each district's budget and expenditures are not required to be tracked to identified students.

Additional state funds are provided (outside the basic State aid formula) for instructional improvement to preschool and school-age programs. Each county receives a base amount and an additional portion as determined by each district's count of exceptional students. These monies must be expended for special education programs. Special programs, or those exceeding normal expenses, can apply for reimbursement of expenses through an additional application process. Examples of programs that have been reimbursed are out-of-state instruction, out-of-county instruction and teacher training programs.

75% of the federal funds under IDEA are allocated to LEAs using each district's count of student's with disabilities. A portion of the 20% of the federal discretionary funds is used for educational programs for students with disabilities who are court ordered to out-of-state facilities, students with disabilities residing in state operated programs (e.g. correctional and health facilities and schools for the deaf and blind), and for supplemental reimbursement for out-of-state and out-of-county instruction. LEAs may also apply for discretionary federal funds for: defraying some costs for starting a Parent/Educator Resource Center or a high-cost program for a particularly severe population, and special education program improvement projects (including staff development) which focus on the inclusion of students (preschool and school-age) with disabilities, transition of students with disabilities from school to work, and/or transition of children from Part H (infants and toddlers) programs to preschool programs.

Criteria for Effective Funding Initiatives

From survey responses, a report by the National Association of State Boards of Education (1992), and discussions with experts in funding practices in special education, characteristics were identified that were associated with model funding initiatives.

State Classifications of Funding Formulas

Funding Formula 1	Funding Formula 2	Funding Formula 3	Funding Formula 4	Funding Formula 5	Funding Formula 6
KS	AK	AL	ID	DE	CO
KY	AZ	CA	LA		CT
NH	AR	IL	MN		ME
ND	FL	MI	OH		MD
PA	GA	MO	WI		MI
	IN	NV	VA		MT
	IA	MS			NE
	MA				NC
	MN				OR
	NY				RI
	OK				SD
	SC				VT
	TN				WA
	TX				WY
	UT				
	WV				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Funding Practices. This category included those characteristics directly related to funding initiatives:

* *Separate policies, funding streams and administrations for special education and general education have been decreased or abolished; special education is provided as a support to general education services rather than as a separate funded, managed division.*
* *Districts are reimbursed per hour of remedial instruction, individual tutoring and psychological services, rather than per numbers of students labeled as having special needs. Specialized services take place inside the regular education classroom as a first priority.*
* *State board has abolished categorical labels for students as a requirement for receiving services.*
* *States board provides grant programs or other incentives, focused at the building level, that encourages experimentation with funding and program instruction to produce model integration approaches.*

o *Funding is distributed to school districts and the local building level; intermediate units are provided with reserve funds for extraordinarily expensive programs of instruction.*

o *Multiple funding sources are tapped for anyone needing specialized instruction, e.g., medicaid reimbursable services.*

* *Payment for residential programming is deducted from payments by state to district level; when the student is returned at least 50% of costs for instruction for individual support services are reimbursed when student is integrated into the regular classroom.*
* *Funding follows students with disabilities based on needs identified by the IEP, pre-referral, or teacher support teams.*

Related Practices. This category included those characteristics that were necessary related policies to inclusion and funding practices:

* *State Board of Education has created a new belief system and vision for education that includes ALL students. This includes clear active leadership that has defined goals and encouraged effective funding and academic strategies to implement the goals.*

o *Funding mechanisms promote joint decision-making and responsibility for ALL students who need help at the school building level.*

* *Local districts are held accountable for learning outcomes such as post-school experiences, knowledge, skills levels, and participation in the community, rather than number/type of courses taken.*
* *Incentives are provided so that academic instruction is complemented with community-based instruction that allows ALL students to learn a variety of life and employment skills in normal community settings.*
* *Incentives are provided that encourage and foster collaborative partnerships and joint training programs between general and special education teachers.*

o *Funding and policy provide incentives for communication at all levels of the system, e.g., administration, teachers, parents and students.*

o *Special education students are counted in the enrollments of regular education teachers.*

From these characteristics, 10 criteria were selected as being the most important for determining effective types of special education funding formulas and initiatives. Project staff and members of the West Virginia Developmental Disabilities Planning Council reached consensus about the importance of these ten characteristics for determining effective fiscal initiatives. These characteristics are marked with an asterisk.

Analysis

Survey questions that provided a multiple response format where respondents were asked to choose their answers from a listing of possible choices were analyzed by using a type of crosstabulation analysis, called multiple response. With this analysis, frequencies were displayed for each of the categories defined and groups of respondents. No other analysis was done that used any inferential statistics due to the small number of responses within some of the cells in the cross-tabulation table.

The parts of the survey providing open-ended questions were analyzed by doing a content analysis. Important themes were identified and the frequency of the themes indicated for each group of respondents. Two persons were used to identify content themes independently. Then the theme categories were compared and discrepancies rectified. Each individual then independently counted the frequency of the themes and then compared responses. Specific points of discrepancy in frequency count were identified and then rectified through further discussion.

Survey Results: Funding Practices

Respondents to the survey indicated incentives and disincentives for inclusion for in-state and residential programs through answering a series of questions. These questions are displayed throughout this report along with a discussion of the answers given.

Incentives For Inclusion within In-state Programs

Survey Question 7: For in-state programs, what are the top incentives for inclusion created by your state's funding formula?

Respondents selected the top two incentives operating in the state from a list of choices offered on the survey. ***The choice of incentives is listed in Table 1 on the next page.*** The ranking of each of the types of incentives is displayed for funding formulas groups 1,2,3,4,5, and 6, West Virginia Special Educators (WV:SE), and West Virginia Principals (WV:PR). Below each of the ranks, the number of responses within each category is provided in parenthesis. The most frequent incentives selected by all groups are bolded, and their rank order provided in the column marked "overall rank". Note that West Virginia responses are listed separately from Funding Formula 2 and are **not** included in those responses. Note also that Funding Formula 5 solely includes the responses of the state of Delaware. A minimal

number of individuals responded from this states and, consequently any conclusions about this category must be very tentative.

As can be seen in Table 1, the most frequent incentives across all types of groups are A, B and D. The choice of F: Other is unique to Funding Formulas 2 and 6, indicating that individuals experiencing these two types of formulas find their formulas not facilitative to inclusion. Alternatively some said the funding formula had nothing to do with providing incentives for inclusion because there had been special regulations written that had effectively gotten around the strictures of the formula.

In general, the choice of specific incentives across funding formula groups including West Virginia is highly similar, with most groups picking A, B and D in their top selections. However, there is some difference in the pattern of responses for Funding Formulas 2 and 6

Table 1. Selection of Type of Incentive Across Respondents for In-State Programs

TYPE OF INCENTIVE	FUNDING FORMULA								OVERALL RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV SE	WV PR	
a. **Funding follows students with disabilities based on needs identified by the IEP, pre-referral or teacher support teams.**	1 (6)	1 (29)	1 (18)	2 (11)	1 (3)	1 (12)	1 (10)	2 (6)	1
b. **Funding rewards placement of students with disabilities into the lowest cost placement which is viewed as the regular classroom.**	4 (2)	3 (10)	3 (5)	3 (7)	3 (1)	2 (11)	2 (6)	2 (6)	3
c. Funding provides incentives to maximize class size in the regular class size in the regular classroom, thereby encouraging placement of students with disabilities in this setting.	__ (0)	6 (2)	4 (4)	4 (4)	__ (0)	5 (5)	5 (2)	3 (2)	
d. **Funding encourages placement in the regular classroom because it is the least intrusive intervention for students with disabilities.**	2 (5)	4 (9)	2 (11)	1 (13)	__ (0)	3 (10)	3 (5)	1 (7)	2
e. Funding provides incentive for the return of out-of-state special education students into the regular classroom.	__ (0)	5 (4)	5 (1)	__ (0)	2 (2)	4 (9)	6 (1)	4 (1)	
f. **Other: predominant response - formula provides NO incentives**	3 (3)	2 (16)	4 (4)	4 (4)	__ (0)	2 (11)	4 (3)	4 (1)	4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as discussed, in addition to Funding Formula 5. This suggests that ***the effect of funding formulas on incentives is not a major one, although there is some effect.***

Survey Question 8: Do specific incentives encourage placement of a particular type of disability into the regular classroom?

Survey Question 8 focused on the effect of specific incentives on particular types of disability. Survey respondents were asked to rate the effect of each incentive on students with disabilities by using the Likert scale indicated below.

1 = encourages placement of those with a developmental disability
2 = encourages placement of those with a non-developmental disability
3 = encourages equal consideration of any student with a disability

Results are indicated in Table 2 below. The percentage of those choosing selection number 3, e.g., incentives encourage equal consideration of any student with disability, is indicated in each column. The STATES column represents responses across all states except West Virginia, while the remaining columns indicate West Virginia's responses for special educators and principals respectively.

The table shows that certain types of incentives are perceived as encouraging placement of those with developmental disabilities into the general education classroom more than those with non-developmental disabilities. For example, Incentive A shows a low percent of selection for option 3 for both West Virginia principals and special educators. Special educators favored a bias toward placement of developmental disabilities into the regular classroom, while principals indicated favoring non-developmental disabilities.

Table 2. Percent selection of option 3 indicating equal effect of incentives on type of disability.

TYPE INCENTIVE	SELECTION #3 STATES	SELECTION #3 WV:SE	WV:PR
a. Funding follows students	90%	70%	60%
b. Funding rewards placement that is lowest in cost, e.g regular classroom	68%	80%	67%
c. Funding encourages maximizing class size in regular classroom	73%	100%	100%
d. Funding rewards placement for least intrusive intervention	89%	100%	100%
e. Funding encourages return of out-of-state placements into regular classroom.	74%	100%	100%
f. Other: Funding formula provides no incentives.	88%	100%	____

For Incentive B, Formula groups 2,3 and 6, in addition to West Virginia principals, indicated particularly low percentages in selection of number three. Funding Formula 2 and 3 respondents indicate a perception of preference for placement of developmental disabilities into the regular classroom, while Funding Formula 6 respondents and West Virginia principals indicate responses equally divided between a bias toward developmental and non-developmental disabilities.

Survey Question 9: Do specific incentives encourage placement of students with disabilities who are at a particular educational level?

For this question, the focus was on the effect of specific incentives on students with disabilities who are at a particular educational level. Respondents were asked to use the Likert scale indicated below to rate each of the incentives that they had chosen for bias toward a particular level of education. ***The results are displayed in Table 3 showing the percentage of selection for the number 5 option for each group of respondents.***

1= parent/infant program level
2 = preschool program level
3 = elementary program level
4 = secondary program level
5 = equal encouragement at all levels

As can be seen, most response groups indicate little effect of the type of incentive on the placement of students with disabilities at a particular educational level in the regular classroom. However, for Incentive B, respondents in Funding Formula groups 2 and 6 indicate there is some preference for placing children with a disability into the regular classroom when they are in elementary school. 33% of West Virginia principals indicated the same perception.

Table 3. Rating of type of incentive in regard to effect on level of education.

TYPE INCENTIVE	SELECTION #3 STATES	SELECTION #3 WV:SE	SELECTION #3 WV:PR
a. Funding follows students	79%	80%	40%
b. Funding rewards placement that is lowest in cost, e.g regular classroom	67%	83%	67%
c. Funding encourages maximizing class size in regular classroom	75%	100%	50%
d. Funding rewards placement for least intrusive intervention	82%	80%	67%
e. Funding encourages return of out-of-state placements into regular classroom.	71%	100%	0%
f. Other: Funding formula provides no incentives	78%	___	___

For incentives C, D and E, there is also a low percentage of selection for option 5 by principals

from West Virginia. They believe there is a bias toward placement of students with disabilities into the regular classroom when they are in elementary school.

Survey Question 10: What are ADDITIONAL incentives provided by your state to encourage integration?

This question was open-ended. Consequently a content analysis was done identifying predominant themes across the responses given. ***The result can be seen in Table 4 on the next page. The frequency of mention for each of the themes is indicated in each column.***

Survey Question 11. What other incentives have you heard about, thought about or created?

Question 11 assumed that respondents were talking about incentives not presently within their state system, as they perceived it. Since the question was open-ended, a content analysis was done to identify major themes. Respondents answers were checked to make sure that the incentives they were discussing were perceived not to be operating in their school system. ***The frequency with which each major theme was discussed is indicated in Table 5.***

Table 5. Other incentives heard of but PERCEIVED NOT TO BE in the school system.

TYPE OF THEME	FUNDING FORMULA							TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV	
a. Money follows students with disabilities to pay for needed services and support staff.	0	3	1	3	4	5	1	17
b. Encouragement, support and training is provided to establish collaborative teams and co-teaching approaches for inclusion classrooms.	0	8	4	5	1	1	2	21
c. Adequate training is provided addressing specific instructional strategies and implementation approaches to achieve quality inclusion in the classroom.	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	6
d. Class sizes are reduced for inclusion classrooms.	0	7	2	2	1	2	0	14
e. There is money for piloting small experimental programs in inclusion in order to develop valid models for inclusion.	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	7
f. A strong inclusion philosophy is in place.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

Table 4. The number of respondents indicating additional incentives in the school system but not listed in Question 7.

TYPE OF THEME	FUNDING FORMULA							TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV	
a. Money follows the students for additional services and teacher aides. (The funding for this appears to come out of a discretionary fund.)	1	7	5	0	1	6	2	22
b. Class sizes are reduced for inclusion classrooms.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
c. There is encouragement of collaborative team teaching or support teams within the regular education classroom.	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	8
d. There is a philosophical mission statement that speaks to inclusion which is perceived to be an important general incentive for encouraging inclusion. However, respondents consistently added there was not enough money to really accomplish what the philosophy stated.	0	7	3	1	1	4	2	18
e. There is money to pilot programs available to a limited number of schools; it is seen as important for experimenting with what works and what doesn't before fully committing to specific building-wide approaches for inclusion.	1	4	2	0	1	4	1	13
f. There has been some training provided in regard to inclusion that the respondent felt was critical for effectively implementing the concept in the classroom.	0	3	2	0	1	4	0	10
g. The philosophy of least restrictive environment was felt to be an important value that aided inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom.	0	1	0	4	1	0	1	7

Disincentives For Integration Into In-state Programs

Survey Question 12. What are the top disincentives for integration created by your state's funding formula?

The most frequent selection of disincentives are A, followed by D and B. These selections are highlighted in the table 6 below. The ranks for each of the funding formula groups and West Virginia are also displayed, followed by the frequency of responses in parenthesis.

Highly similar disincentives are selected across all groups in general. However, there are some differences in ranking for Formula groups 2 and 3, contrasted to the remaining formula groups including West Virginia special educators. West Virginia principals again show their uniqueness of response by indicating a singular rating pattern not characteristics of any of the other groups. In general, however, these differences are minor in comparison to the highly similar pattern of ranks displayed in Table 6. The effect of the funding formula on disincentives for integration is therefore a mild one.

Table 6. Frequency of Disincentives Across State Formulas and West Virginia.

TYPE OF DISINCENTIVE	FUNDING FORMULA								OVERALL RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV SE	WV PR	
a. **Categorization of students into disability groupings.**	1 (5)	2 (22)	2 (12)	1 (20)	1 (2)	1 (18)	1 (11)	2 (4)	**1**
b. **Incentives to serve students with disabilities in higher reimbursement placements, e.g., special education classrooms.**	2 (3)	1 (26)	3 (11)	3 (8)	1 (2)	3 (10)	2 (8)	2 (4)	**3**
c. Misclassification of students with disabilities into special education placements to gain high reimbursement.	3 (1)	3 (7)	4 (3)	4 (3)	2 (1)	4 (5)	4 (2)	1 (5)	
d. **Incentives for placing students with disabilities into special education classes because they are a lower class size than the regular classroom.**	2 (3)	1 (26)	1 (17)	2 (17)	2 (1)	2 (13)	3 (3)	1 (5)	**2**
e. Other: predominant responses listed below: (1) funding formula is neither incentive or disincentive (2) no money for aides in regular classroom	3 (1)	3 (7)	5 (2)	5 (2)	— (0)	5 (3)	5 (1)	— (0)	

Survey Question 13. Do the disincentives that you checked discourage the integration of a particular type of disability into the regular classroom?

This question focused on whether specific disincentives discourage a particular type of disability. The Likert scale choices offered to respondents are shown below, while the ***results can be seen in Table 7.***

1 = discourages placement of those with a developmental disability
2 = discourages placement of those with a non-developmental disability
3 = discourages inclusion of no particular type of disability

In the table, the percentage of those choosing selection number 3 is indicated in each column. The STATES column represents the percentage of response across states other than West Virginia. The remaining columns indicate West Virginia's response from special educators and principals respectively.

For the STATES group and West Virginia Special Educators, all disincentives except D and E display a markedly low choice for option 3 across all formula groups. ***A more indepth look at respondents answers indicated a belief that students with developmental disabilities are more likely to be negatively affected than those with non-developmental disability by the specific disincentive.*** West Virginia principals, in contrast, find no one type of disability particularly affected by disincentives A and B. In comparison, for disincentives C and D, the principals perceive a negative effect on students with developmental disabilities. This is in sharp contrast to the rest of the groups who perceive no type of disability particularly affected by these disincentives.

Table 7. Rating of the effect of each disincentive on the type of disability.

TYPE OF DISINCENTIVE	SELECTION #3 STATES	SELECTION #3 WV:SE	SELECTION #3 WV:PR
a. Categorization of students.	60%	46%	100%
b. Incentives for higher reimbursement	61%	50%	75%
c. Misclassification of students	46%	50%	50%
d. Incentives for placement into lower class size, e.g., special education class	68%	67%	40%
e. Other responses	79%	0%	___

Survey Question 14. Do specific disincentives that you checked discourage the placement of students with disabilities who are at a particular educational level?

This question focused on the effect of disincentives on educational level. Respondents were asked to use the Likert scale on the next page to indicate whether each disincentive

discouraged the placement of students with disabilities in the regular classroom at a particular educational level.

1 = parent-infant program level
2 = preschool program level
3 = elementary program level
4 = secondary program level
5 = no bias for any program level

The results of this analysis can be found below in Table 8.

Table 8. Percent of those selecting option 5 indicating equal discouragement to place in regular classrooms for all levels of education for each type disincentive.

TYPE OF DISINCENTIVE	SELECTION #5 STATES	SELECTION #5 WV:SE	SELECTION #5 WV:PR
a. Categorization of students.	87%	73%	100%
b. Incentives for higher reimbursement	87%	74%	75%
c. Misclassification of students	89%	100%	50%
d. Incentives for placement into lower class size, e.g., special education class	78%	100%	40%
e. Other responses	87%	100%	___

For all types of funding formula groups across states, and West Virginia special educators, equal discouragement at all levels is clear from the high percentage of scores under selection number five. In contrast, the principals indicated a perception of bias toward discouragement for inclusion of students with disabilities in elementary school.

Incentives for Integration From Residential Program Into In-state Programs

Survey Question 15: For RESIDENTIAL programs, what are the top incentives for inclusion created by your state's funding formula?

Respondents selected the top two incentives operating presently within their school system. ***Ranking for each type of incentive across funding formulas and West Virginia in provided in Table 9 on the next page.*** Frequency of response is in parenthesis below the rank order of the incentive. As can be seen from this table , Incentive A, funding follows student, is the overwhelming best incentive for integrating students with disabilities back into the regular classroom from residential placement. For Funding Formulas 1,3,4 and the West Virginia principals, an additional top incentive includes D.

Table 9. Incentives for returning residentials students to general education classroom.

TYPE OF INCENTIVE	FUNDING FORMULA								OVERALL RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV SE	WV PR	
Funding follows students with disabilities based on needs identified by the IEP, pre-referral or teacher support teams.	2 (4)	1 (23)	1 (15)	2 (11)	1 (2)	2 (10)	1 (8)	2 (6)	1
b. **Funding rewards placement of students with disabilities into the lowest cost placement which is viewed as the regular classroom.**	5 (1)	4 (6)	3 (3)	3 (10)	2 (1)	1 (11)	2 (5)	3 (2)	**3**
c. Funding provides incentives to maximize class size in the regular class size in the regular classroom, thereby encouraging placement of students with disabilities in this setting.	6 (0)	5 (1)	4 (2)	5 (2)	3 (0)	4 (3)	4 (3)	3 (2)	
d. **Funding encourages placement in the regular classroom because it is the least intrusive intervention for students with disabilities.**	1 (5)	4 (6)	2 (7)	1 (12)	3 (0)	3 (6)	5 (2)	1 (7)	**2**
e. **Funding provides incentive for the return of out-of-state special education students into the regular classroom.**	4 (2)	2 (9)	3 (3)	4 (3)	3 (0)	2 (10)	3 (4)	4 (1)	**4**
f. Other: predominant response - formula provides NO incentives	3 (3)	3 (8)	4 (2)	6 (1)	3 (0)	4 (3)	5 (2)	5 (0)	

For the Funding Formula 5 group, and West Virginia special educators, there is a preference for the incentive B, in addition to strongly preferring A. These incentives are bolded in the table above. For both Funding Formula groups 2 and 6, there is a preference for incentive E as a strong second choice. It is interesting that 19 respondents indicated that their funding formula provided no incentive for the return of residential students into the regular classroom.

The difference in patterns for these groups suggest a moderate impact of the various funding formulas on providing incentives for inclusion. This should be tempered with the knowledge that a substantial number of respondents found their funding formula provided no incentives toward inclusion of residential students into the general education classroom.

Survey Question 16: Do specific incentives encourage placement of a particular type of disability into the regular classroom?

This question focused the type of disability and the impact of certain incentives. Respondents used the scale shown to rate each of the incentives for effect of those with disabilities. The ***percentage of those choosing option 3 is indicated in Table 10 below.***

1 = encourages placement of those with a developmental disability
2 = encourages placement of those with a non-developmental disability
3 = encourages equal consideration of any students with disability

Table 10. Percent of respondents selecting option 3 indicating equal encouragement for inclusion of all types of disabilities for each incentive.

TYPE INCENTIVE	SELECTION #3 STATES	SELECTION #3 WV:SE	SELECTION #3 WV:PR
a. Funding follows students	77%	50%	100%
b. Funding rewards placement that is lowest in cost, e.g regular classroom	54%	60%	100%
c. Funding encourages maximizing class size in regular classroom	73%	67%	100%
d. Funding rewards placement for least intrusive intervention	81%	100%	67%
e. Funding encourages return of out-of-state placements into regular classroom.	67%	75%	100%
f. Other: Funding formula provides no incentives.	76%	50%	____

Incentive B. For funding formula groups 3, 4, and 6 and West Virginia special educators, there is a perception of bias toward encouraging placement of those with a developmental disability into the regular classroom. For Formula group 2, the bias is perceived to be toward non-developmental disability.

Incentive A and F. For West Virginia special educators, these specific incentives impact the most on those with developmental disability. All other respondents felt there was equal consideration given to any student with a disability for these two incentives.

Survey Question 17: For those in residential placement, do specific incentives encourage placement of students with disabilities into the regular classroom who are at a particular educational level?

This question is addressing the effect of incentives for inclusion on residential students at certain educational levels. Respondents were asked to use the Likert scale below to rate the effect of each incentive.

1 = parent/infant program level
2 = preschool program level
3 = elementary program level
4 = secondary program level
5 = equal consideration at all levels

The percent of respondents who selected option 5 are indicated in the Table 11 below.

Table 11. Percent of respondents who selected option 5, indicating equal encouragement of return of residential students at all levels of education.

TYPE INCENTIVE	SELECTION #5 STATES	SELECTION #5 WV:SE	SELECTION #5 WV:PR
a. Funding follows students	78%	88%	100%
b. Funding rewards placement that is lowest in cost, e.g regular classroom	74%	80%	0%
c. Funding encourages maximizing class size in regular classroom	78%	100%	100%
d. Funding rewards placement for least intrusive intervention	81%	100%	67%
e. Funding encourages return of out-of-state placements into regular classroom.	81%	100%	100%
f. Other: Funding formula provides no incentives	90%	100%	____

With the exception of West Virginia principals, all respondents perceived equal encouragement for all incentives at all levels of education. In contrast, West Virginia principals thought there was an inclination toward favoring students at the elementary level for Incentives B and D.

Survey Question 18: What are additional incentives provided by your state to encourage integration from residential placements into the regular classroom?

This question was open-ended; therefore a content analysis was done identifying predominant

themes in the responses given. ***The result can be seen in Table 12 below***. The frequency of the responses are recorded for each type of incentive along with the total number of responses given for each type of incentive theme that was identified.

Table 12. Additional incentives for return of residential students that are present in the system but not mentioned by respondent in Question 15.

TYPE OF THEME	FUNDING FORMULA							TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV	
a. Money follows the students for additional services and teacher aides.	0	5	2	0	0	4	0	11
b. There is money to pilot programs which provides for experimenting with what works and what doesn't for inclusion of residential level students into the regular classroom.	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	5
c. There is intensive training provided in regard to inclusion that provides for knowledge and strategies specific to residential level students' needs and services.	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
d. The philosophy of least restrictive environment is an important value that aids inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
e. Support teams, co-teaching and collaborative teams are intensively encouraged and training is provided	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
f. Intervention teams are present to help plan the transition from residential placement to general education.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
g. Residential programs don't exist; residential programs aren't funded well. This fact acts as an incentive to provide services in the regular classroom since there is little or no alternative.	0	2	3	1	0	2	1	9

Survey Question 19. What other incentives have you heard about, thought about or created?

This question assumed that respondents were talking about incentives not presently within their state system as they perceived it. The question was open-ended and a content analysis was done to identify major themes; respondents answers were checked to make sure that the incentives they were discussing were perceived not to be operating in the school system. ***The number of responses for each theme that was identified are indicated in Table 13 below.***

Table 13. Additional incentives for return of residential students that are perceived as NOT present in the school system .

TYPE OF THEME	FUNDING FORMULA							TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV	
a. Money follows the students for additional services and teacher aides.	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	**5**
b. Class size is reduced for inclusion classes dealing with particularly severe students.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	**1**
c. There is intensive training provided in regard to inclusion that is critical for effectively implementing the concept in the classroom.	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	**3**
d. There is a motivating system-wide philosophy that drives decision-making at all levels	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**1**
e. Support teams, co-teaching and collaborative teams are intensively encouraged	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	**3**
f. Intervention teams are present to help plan the transition from residential placement to general education.	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	**4**

Disincentives For Integration Into In-state Programs from Residential Placements

Survey Question 20. What are the top disincentives for integration of students from residential placements into the regular classroom created by your state's funding formula

The ranking of disincentives for inclusion of student from residential placements into the regular classroom is indicated In Table 14 below. The ranking of disincentives for each of the funding formula groups and West Virginia is displayed with the response frequencies in parenthesis beneath the rank order. Bolded disincentives represent those most frequently chosen across types of funding formulas and their overall rank order is indicated in the far column.

Table 14. Type of disincentives for integration of residential students into the regular classroom.

TYPE OF DISINCENTIVE	FUNDING FORMULA								OVERALL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV SE	WV PR	RANK
a. **Categorization of students into disability groupings.**	1 (7)	3 (16)	2 (9)	1 (16)	2 (0)	1 (13)	1 (6)	1 (5)	**1**
b. **Incentives to serve students with disabilities in higher reimbursement placements, e.g special education classrooms.**	2 (2)	1 (19)	2 (9)	3 (6)	1 (1)	2 (11)	3 (2)	2 (4)	**3**
c. Misclassification of students with disabilities into special education placements to gain high reimbursement.	2 (2)	5 (5)	3 (3)	5 (2)	2 (0)	4 (4)	3 (2)	2 (4)	
d. **Incentives for placing students with disabilities into special education classes because they are a lower class size than the regular classroom.**	2 (2)	2 (18)	1 (10)	2 (10)	1 (1)	3 (8)	2 (6)	2 (4)	**2**
e. OTHER: predominant responses = (1) none, (2) no money available to pay extra aid, or specialized support needed by students in residential placements.	2 (2)	4 (7)	3 (3)	4 (5)	1 (1)	4 (4)	4 (1)	3 (1)	

Again there is an impact by the type of funding formula considered, but the impact is moderate at best. That is, Disincentives A,B, and D are consistently chosen among the top disincentives by most of the formula groups, including West Virginia respondents. No drastically different pattern is evident such as selection of C as the highest one in anyone of the groupings.

Survey Question 21. Do the disincentives that you checked discourage the integration of residential students with a particular type of disability into the regular classroom?

Respondents were asked to rate the effect of each disincentive on the inclusion of residential students who have a particular type of disability. The Likert scale indicated was used to rate each choice.

1 = discourages placement of those with a developmental disability
2 = discourages placement of those with a non-developmental disability
3 = discourages inclusion of no particular type of disability

The results from the analysis are indicated in Table 15 below. In the table, the percentage of those choosing selection number 3 above are indicated in each column. The STATES column represents the percentage of response across states other than West Virginia. The remaining columns indicate West Virginia's response from special educators and principals respectively.

Table 15. Percent of those selecting option 3 indicating equal effect on all types of disabilities for discouragement of placement in an inclusive classroom for residential students.

TYPE OF DISINCENTIVE	SELECTION #3 STATES	SELECTION #3 WV:SE	SELECTION #3 WV:PR
a. Categorization of students.	62%	62%	___
b. Incentives for higher reimbursement	72%	50%	100%
c. Misclassification of students	63%	50%	33%
d. Incentives for placement into lower class size, e.g., special education class	68%	50%	75%
e. Other responses	64%	0%	100%

<u>Disincentive A</u>. For the States group and West Virginia special educators , disincentive A showed a marked negative impact on students with developmental disabilities in discouraging inclusion into the general education classroom.

<u>Disincentive C, D and E</u>. According to STATES respondents and WV special educators, these disincentives negatively effect a particular type disability in discouraging inclusion. For C, a negative impact on students with developmental disabilities is clear, while for D and E the negative impact is evenly split between students with developmental disabilities and those with non-developmental disabilities . That is, 50% said there was a negative impact on developmental disability and the other 50%, non-developmental disability. For the

disincentive, West Virginia principals also indicate a strong negative impact on inclusion for those with developmental disabilities.

Survey Question 22. Do the specific disincentives that you checked for inclusion of residential students in the classroom discourage the placement of students who are at a particular educational level?

The focus for this question was on the effect of specific disincentives on residential students at a particular educational level. Using the scale indicated, respondents rate the effect of each disincentive. ***The results of this analysis can be found below in Table 16.***

1 = parent-infant program level
2 = preschool program level
3 = elementary program level
4 = secondary program level
5 = equal discouragement at all levels

Table 16. Percentage of those selecting option 5, equal discouragement of inclusion at all education levels, while considering each disincentive

TYPE OF DISINCENTIVE	SELECTION #5 STATES	SELECTION #5 WV:SE	SELECTION #5 WV:PR
a. Categorization of students.	84%	100%	—
b. Incentives for higher reimbursement	84%	50%	100%
c. Misclassification of students	79%	50%	33%
d. Incentives for placement into lower class size, e.g., special education class	73%	84%	75%
e. Other responses	77%	100%	100%

For the States respondents, there is equal discouragement of inclusion for all educational levels for all disincentives. For West Virginia special educators and principals, disincentive C is judged to provide a more negative impact on those students in elementary school.

Factors Creating Incentives: Instate Programs:

For in-state programs, the major factors that create incentives for inclusion in the general education classroom are (1) the philosophy created by the state, (2) federal regulations, and (3) advocacy. Specific ranking and the mean of the ratings for each factor can be seen in Table 17 on the next page. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of a list of factors provided using a Likert scale from one to three, with one being important. Therefore, the lower the mean, the more important the factor. The rank for each factor is listed first followed by the group mean for each category listed.

TABLE 17. FACTORS THAT CREATE INCENTIVES FOR INCLUSION WITHIN IN-STATE PROGRAMS.

INCENTIVE FACTORS	FORMULA GROUP: MEAN AND RANK							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV	OVERALL
a. Funding formula	2	4	4	4	1	5	4	3
	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.4	1.0	2.4	2.2	2.2
b. Advocacy	1	2	3	3	4	3	5	2
	1.0	1.8	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.1	2.4	2.0
c. School system philosophy	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
	2.2	1.6	1.6	1.1	2.7	1.6	1.7	1.7
d. Federal regulations	5	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
	2.6	2.1	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.0
e. Specialized training of teachers	4	5	5	4	2	4	3	4
	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.3

Although there is a general similarity in ranks across all factors, there are some significant exceptions to the rule for each of the funding formula groups. This indicates a mild to moderate effect of funding formula on factors thought to be the most important. Additionally, there is a distinct difference in the ranking of important factors between West Virginia special educators and West Virginia principals. Principals indicated that Federal regulations and teacher training were the most important factors for creating incentives for inclusion. In contrast, the special educators noted the importance of school system philosophy and advocacy.

Factors Creating Incentives: Residential Programs:

The overall ranking of factors that create incentives for inclusion for residential programs indicate that Federal regulations are the most important, followed by the school system philosophy and advocacy. These are the same factors seen for in-state programs, but in a different order. The rank of each factor for each of the funding formula groups and West Virginia is ***shown in Table 18 on the next page***. Ranks are followed by the group mean.

TABLE 18. FACTORS THAT CREATE INCENTIVES FOR INCLUSION WITHIN RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS.

INCENTIVE FACTORS	FORMULA GROUP: MEAN AND RANK							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV	OVERALL
a. Funding formula	2	3	3	2	1	3	4	4
	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.0	2.2	2.6	2.1
b. Advocacy	1	2	1	4	4	3	3	3
	1.7	1.9	1.8	2.2	3.0	2.2	2.1	2.0
c. School system philosophy	3	2	3	3	3	1	2	2
	2.2	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.5	1.8	1.8	1.9
d. Federal regulations	3	1	2	1	4	2	1	1
	2.2	1.7	1.7	1.8	3.0	2.0	1.7	1.8
e. Specialized training of teachers	4	4	4	5	2	2	1	5
	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.0	2.0	1.7	2.2

When each of the rows are examined for similarity of ranks, it is difficult to find. That is the funding formula groups evidence very different rankings across the board for all factors with the exception of school philosophy. This would suggest that the impact of funding formulas is more significant for residential programs than for in-state programs.

Impact of Inclusion on Students with Disabilities

The impact of inclusion in general education classrooms on students with disabilities can be seen in Table 19 on the next page. Means of the ratings given for each type of impact are indicated in addition to rank order. The lower the mean the more important the impact. ***The major impact of inclusion is increased social integration, followed by changed teacher expectations that are more positive toward students with disabilities. Finally, the last impact is changed teacher expectations that are more negative toward students with disabilities.*** In general all groups agreed on the importance of these factors, regardless of funding formula type. It is interesting that improvement or decrease in academic achievement were the least important impacts of inclusion in general across groups.

TABLE 19. IMPACT OF INCLUSION PRACTICES ON FUNDING FORMULA GROUPS.

IMPACT OF INCLUSION	FORMULA GROUP: MEAN AND RANK							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	WV	OVERALL
a. Social integration	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.6
b. Increase in academic	4	4	3	2	3	4	5	5
achievement	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.3
c. Decrease in academic	5	5	2	4	4	1	4	4
achievement	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.7	3.0	1.3	2.1	2.2
d. More positive teacher	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2
expectations	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.5	1.7	2.0	2.0
e. More negative teacher	2	2	4	3	—	4	2	3
expectations	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.4		2.7	1.9	2.1

Impact of type of disability. Using cross tabulation analysis, the impact of type of disability was examined. Across groups, there was a consistent and significant perception that the impacts listed had a far greater effect on developmental disabilities than non-developmental disabilities, particularly for those that were judged to be the most important.

Impact of educational level. Across all groups except the West Virginia principals, there was judged to be little or no effect of impact of inclusion on students at different educational levels. In contrast, principals from West Virginia indicated they believed there was a greater effect on students at a certain educational level; however they evenly split between the effect being at a secondary level and at an elementary level.

Six Model States

Six model states were selected through the use of the criteria listed earlier. The greater the number of characteristics displayed by the states in their responses to the nation-wide survey, the higher the state was ranked. No state displayed more than four of these characteristics. ***The six model states selected were Pennsylvania, Indiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Wisconsin, and Arkansas.***

Structured Telephone Interview

A structured telephone interview was developed to identify critical implementation factors for successful funding initiatives. The interview focused on probing for important funding practices that made the implementation if inclusion successful. Associated policy initiatives were also a focus, in addition to having interviewees rank and comment on each of the criteria used to determined model states. See Appendix B for the interview format. At least five respondents were interviewed in each of the six states. Selection of respondents in each state was spread across state directors and coordinators of special education to special education teachers in both rural and urban areas.

Ranking of Model States Criteria

From the results of the structured telephone interview, the 10 criteria identifying effective funding initiatives and related policies were ranked in importance as indicated in the box below. To obtain the ranks, individuals were asked to rate the importance of each of the criteria for a successful inclusion program. A Likert scale was used with one being not important and five being highly important.

FUNDING PRACTICES AND RELATED POLICIES FOR INCLUSION FROM MODEL STATES	IMPORTANCE	RANK
1. Development and implementation of a broad philosophy supporting inclusion,	4.5	1
2. Collaboration and mutual training for both general and special education teachers,	4.5	1
3. Presence of incentive programs,	4.4	2
4. Academic instruction supplemented by community based instruction and experiences,	4.3	3
5. Local schools held responsible for learning outcomes of the students,	4.1	4
6. Funding follows the student,	4.1	4
7. Separation of funding streams eliminated or decreased,	3.8	5
8. Elimination of categorical labels,	3.8	5
9. Incentives to bring back individuals from residential placements, including wrap-around funding	2.8	6
10. Services reimbursed rather than counting the number of students.	2.4	7

A Capsule of the Model States

Indiana. This state started inclusion through 10 pilot programs to evaluate what might be good operational models. $200,000 was provided by the state legislature for a one year basis, with decreasing amounts provided over a certain number of years. Those who responded to questions felt that funding pilot initiatives like this was essential for inclusion success so that effective model systems could be developed . These models will then be used as operational demonstrations so that the entire school system can be gradually included.

Funding for students with disabilities is based on a priority of providing services in the regular classroom where reimbursement for services is provided in 1/2 day increments. Revised rules have just been provided for their funding formula which is a pupil weighted system. The rules allow the money to be funneled to the regular classroom. Indiana is classified under Funding Formula 2.

Funding streams of special education and general education have not been integrated, but territoriality in regard to expenditure of funds for specific needs has decreased. Fiscal policy for residential placement emphasizes "wrap around funding". That is, services are purchased outside of the school building but close to home to provide for specialized needs when necessary. State placement policies also make residential placement very difficult to obtain.

There is an inclusion philosophy and general plan that was developed by a broad-based committee consisting of principals, parents, special and general education teachers, and paraprofessionals. The philosophy allows flexibility around categorical labeling by discouraging the use of such labels in day-to-day practice.

Commitment to the inclusion philosophy was felt to be integral to guiding individuals at the state and local levels in a positive direction toward inclusion, in addition to providing a guide for everyday decision-making. To nurture the evolvement of the philosophy and to provide for a forum for problem solving and success sharing, broad based area forums are held on a monthly basis. At the building level, schools have free rein to decide on what is best for them

Pennsylvania. The state's inclusion efforts started with a broad-based planning committee that met over a period of one year. The results were: (1) the development of a system-wide philosophy for inclusion, (2) a strategic plan, and (3) a blueprint for drastically revising the state special education funding formula.

Pennsylvania's funding formula provides for special education services by using a flat funding reimbursement approach. A single weight for a percentage of the general education formula is agreed on regardless of the number of children or services provided. The total amount awarded to district special education = **average** daily membership x 16% (% of students with disabilities nationally) x X (amount of state special education funding per student based on set percentage of general education formula). The change in formula provides no incentive for separate special education classes, but rather puts a priority on the

regular classroom where general education and special education funds are mixed and matched to provide for individualized services to students who need specialized help. The us of a flat fee to fund services is characteristic of Funding Formula 1.

Residential placements have been seriously discouraged because of strong advocacy directed at the school system. The state has provided extra money to encourage getting students back into regular programs. Additionally, a new regulation has mandated that delivery of services should be in the home school environment.

Incentive monies for pilot programs, intensive teacher training, and a strong inclusion philosophy and goals are believed to be integral to the success of an inclusion program. Money has been provided to schools to pilot inclusion programs; the funding has been obtained from discretionary monies and grants. Intensive teacher training is provided to those trying inclusion. New regulations provide heavy encouragement to try inclusion at the local level. 170 school districts have signed up as the first wave to build programs around the inclusion philosophy.

Arkansas. Funding is based on placement needs, not on the category of disability; a weighted factor is provided that allows itinerant/consultant instruction in the regular classroom. Weighting is provided according to student needs for services. The present priority is focused on services in the general education classroom. Arkansas is classified under Funding Formula 2.

In regard to residential placement, districts are not penalized for placement in a residential setting, but a greater weight of reimbursement is provided for those returning to the home district to help provide for needed services there. Classrooms that have students with disabilities are reduced in size.

No new monies were provided for system start-up for inclusion. All schools were informed of the new inclusion philosophy and policy, and expected to implement it. School districts are monitored in regard to their inclusion efforts. Specialized models for inclusion that are proposed by a school can obtain small grants on a limited basis to field test the idea. These models have produced partnerships with outside resources and agencies. An example of this is an agreement between mental health and the education system where mental health provides for counseling in class, in addition to home and family counseling.

Wisconsin In this state, special education teachers are funded at 56% of their salary. This is characteristic of the Funding Formula 4 category. Teachers are encouraged to work in teams, and do collaborative consultation with other teachers. Prior to establishing the regulation that special education services could be provided in the general education classroom, teachers were limited to the special education classroom.

Grant monies are supplementing federal and state monies in developing and implementing inclusion. Incentive money is offered to schools interested in starting an inclusion program.

Money is provided for planning time to come up with a building level plan for inclusion. Responsibility and control is at the building level for the inclusion program. Funding for inclusion programming is limited however.

Development of an inclusion philosophy is viewed as important for district level motivation and commitment Both Federal and state laws reinforce inclusion philosophy and provide further incentive to focus on this approach.

From the responses given by individuals interviewed, there appears to be a significant amount of resistance to inclusion at the grass-roots/building level within the state. There is a feeling that the state is trying to tell them what to do, rather than asking and collaborating with them. In addition, teachers feel a significant lack of expertise in collaborative team teaching, and feel little intensive system-wide training has been provided due to the constraint on funds.

An educational cooperative group serves small schools that normally wouldn't be able to afford necessary services for students with severe disabilities.

Massachusetts. The inclusion initiative was started through providing money for pilot programs. Seven districts over five years will be provided with funds. Grants have been written at the state level to acquire additional Federal monies to help with inclusion for specific projects. Monies have been diverted to provide training for teachers and paraprofessionals that support the classroom. Some of the paraprofessionals are being trained to help transition students coming back from a residential placement into the regular classroom.

In regard to funding practices, a specialized funding stream is provided for high costs placements or services. Massachusetts is a Funding Formula 2 system. Money is provided for services as the child needs it.

Inclusion is an expected outcomes within the state; many discussions are focused on inclusion and what it means, and its value. How to structure the program is left to the building and district levels. Teacher evaluation is focused on rewarding quality inclusion practices in the classroom. A pre-referral system exists were students having trouble are referred to the team for discussion and evaluation; children referred do not have to be labeled special education.

Maryland A Funding Formula 6 state, Maryland is still in a limited piloting phase of starting an inclusion initiative. A philosophy and policy for inclusion was developed at the state level. Pilots have been partially funded by Federal grant monies, a system change grant. A bill was passed in the state legislature that provides for wrap-around funding for severe disabilities. This discourages placement in residential programs. There is categorical labeling for special education students in the state, but non-categorical services are provided.

There is an overall philosophy for inclusion but very little money to implement the concept. There is an emphasis of preschool programs. Long range planning for inclusion is done at

the building level. Intensive inservice training has been provided to pilot schools.

Model States' Recommendations for Implementation

Themes were identified for all open-ended questions through performing a qualitative analysis. The themes that were frequently mentioned by the six states as being important to implementation will be discussed on the next page.

1. **Residential placements:** to encourage inclusion into the regular classroom for residential level students, wrap-around funding and alternative structures for acquiring the needed services in the home district, was a recurring theme for three out of the six states. Those that described this process seemed pleased with the result in general. Others indicated the importance of maintaining a higher level funding for students coming back from residential placements to provide for services in the home district.

2. **Money for services**: one of the most common funding formula models within this group of six states was Funding Formula 2, where funds are provided for the level of services needed by students with disabilities. High levels of service are not mandated for special education classes. Rather the regular classroom is the least restrictive placement and is the first priority in regard to trying to provide services there. This seems to provide flexibility for these programs. However, Pennsylvania evidences a flat fee approach that seems to be working well.

3. **Belief system for inclusion developed by broad based support**: All states emphasized the need to establish a strong philosophy or belief system for inclusion. The importance of the philosophy was seen as either a way to "motivate" LEAs to try inclusion because this was state policy, or as a way of guiding the behavior of individual teachers, administrators and schools on an every day basis through belief in the philosophy and its importance. The latter approach seemed to have a much more positive effect in regard to getting positive results on a practical implementation basis.

A Primer For INCLUSION

- ***Wrap-around funding***
- ***Money for services that is flexible***
- ***A powerful belief system developed by broad-based support at the state and local level***
- ***Incentive funding for pilots***
- ***Intensive training***

One of the ways the philosophy became internalized in these states was through its development, not only at the state level, but also at the local level, through broad-based on-going planning and development teams. Specific beliefs mentioned by interviewees as being important include:

- o all students are unique and have different learning styles
- o students need opportunities to learn that maximize potential

- o teachers must meet students at their level and help them to grow,
- o all students can learn,
- o all students have worth,
- o educate students for the future,
- o develop lifelong learners.

4. **Incentive funding**: through discretionary funding, grants or re-allocating Federal monies, every state had some type of special funding allocated to provide for piloting of novel inclusion projects within specific schools. All mentioned the importance of this for a successful inclusion attempt.

5. **Training for inclusion**: the importance of training was mentioned over and over again, particularly at the local level. There often was a discrepancy between state directors of special education, and special education teachers and supervisors in regard to the satisfactory quality and intensity of the training provided . That is, the director felt that training had been at least adequate, while more local individuals felt it had not. There often seemed to be a lack of realization and/or money at the state level that training and technical assistance needed to be on-going as schools experimented with inclusive programs. New needs for information and techniques arose, both at the teaching and managerial levels, as the program evolved.

A Capsule of the State of West Virginia Now

The **present funding formula** for West Virginia was described earlier. It is classified as a Formula 2 approach because of its weighting system where special education students are counted by a factor of 3:1.

For West Virginia, whether considering in-state or residential programs, the **most important incentives for inclusion presently operating** in the school system to a greater or lesser degree are:

1 Funding follows the students,
2. Funding rewards placement of students in the lowest cost classroom,
3. Funding encourages placement in the least restrictive environment which is seen as the regular classroom,
4. There is an overall philosophy that encourages inclusion into the general education classroom,
5. Money is available for pilot projects, and
6. Training has been provided to facilitate the acquisition of necessary skills for inclusion.

However, in Question 11 on the survey, some respondents indicated that there was not enough money for following the student to adequately support services, support for developing and maintaining a collaborative team approach was weak, and there was not enough money for piloting inclusion programs.

The **major disincentives for in-state and residential programs** in West Virginia presently operating were:

1. Categorization of students,
2. Incentives operating in the system for placing students into higher reimbursement placements, e.g., the special education class.
3. Incentives for placing students in classes with lower class size.

The most important **impacts of inclusion** were seen as:

1. Greater social integration, and
2. Teacher attitudes and expectations that became both more positive and more negative in regard to students with disabilities.

The most **important factors that produced incentives for inclusion** were:

1. School system philosophy
2. Federal regulations
3. Specialized training/education of teachers

Documents from the West Virginia school system were analyzed that focused on inclusion. One document was entitled, "A Needs-Based Formula Final Recommendations", and a second labeled, "West Virginia's Integrated Education Initiative". The latter document focuses on West Virginia's plan for building inclusion in the school system. The development of the plan was done by a broad-based committee as recommended by the model states' experiences. There was a vision and mission statement development for inclusion, along with specific goals. However, the impact of the plan appears to remain mostly at the state level. That is, from West Virginia respondents, there was a feeling that the mission and vision for inclusion were not clear; goals and strategies were not well-elaborated at the implementation level, and that inclusion was something that was expected of local schools but little resources were available to do it.

In regard to the proposed needs based formula, Category VII appeared to provide a good way of providing for flexible services within the general education classroom for students who needed special help. Any revision of West Virginia's funding formula could use this type of category as one aspect of the new formula.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

1. Certain types of incentives facilitate the inclusion of students with disabilities across all types of funding formulas. Across all states and West Virginia, the same types of incentives for inclusion generally appeared as the top ranked incentives for inclusion. Whether considering in-state programs or residential programs, they were the same. The type of incentives that facilitate inclusion the most are:

a. funding that follows the student with disabilities based on individual needs,

b. funding that rewards placement of students with disabilities into the lowest cost placement, e.g., the general education classroom
c. funding encourages placement in the regular classroom because it is the least intrusive intervention,
d. encouragement support and training is provided to establish collaborative teams and teaching practices for inclusive classrooms,
e. a philosophical mission statement that speaks to inclusion including important values and beliefs and has been integrated into the everyday functioning of administrative and teaching behavior as a guide to decision-making and teaching behavior, and
g. money for piloting programs to develop effective quality models for inclusion.

A type of incentive, not present in most school systems but desired by many teachers in in-state programs including West Virginia, is the reduction of class size for inclusive classrooms. A second incentive for returning students with disabilities from residential placements was mentioned most frequently by those states selected as model states. Wrap around funding is a specialized case of money following the student of individual needs. Here additional money is provided to fund specialized services in the home-school district, that ordinarily would have been obtained only in a residential placement.

2. Certain types of disincentives act as barriers to inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom across all types of funding formulas. Respondents from West Virginia and other states across the nation, generally selected the same types of disincentives as the top barriers to inclusion of students with disabilities. These disincentives were the same for both residential and in-state programs. Major barriers to inclusion include:

a. categorization of students into certain disability groupings.
b. incentives to serve students with disabilities in higher reimbursement placements, e.g., special education classrooms.
c. incentives for placing students with disabilities into special education classes because they are a lower class size than the regular classroom.

3. The type of funding formula does not have a major effect on the practice of inclusion in the public school system. Whether in West Virginia or in other states, the responses of those answering the survey questions indicated that the funding formula in their state had minimal to no effect on inclusion practices. This perception was corroborated by the data for most of the questions on the survey. That is, there was some to moderate effect evidenced by differences in patterns depending on the type of funding formula under consideration. But, in general, the differences were not major ones, and there was a high similarity across types of funding formulas in the types of incentives and disincentives that most affected inclusion. If the type of funding formula had a major effect, there should have been significantly different patterns of the most effective incentives for inclusion and the greatest disincentives. This was not the case, with one exception.

In regard to considering *factors that create incentives for inclusion* (funding formula, advocacy, school system philosophy, Federal regulations), for residential programs only there were major differences apparent. Across all funding formula groups, ranking of the factors that create incentives for inclusion was drastically different. This may mean that the *perception of impact* by the funding formula as an incentive to create inclusion is significant for residential placements. In fact, however, the types of incentives and disincentives for inclusion selected by respondents did not show great differences regardless of the group under consideration. Thus, *the perception of impact may be greater than reality*.

4. **In West Virginia and many of the other states across the nation, students with developmental disabilities are frequently perceived as benefitting more from certain types of incentives for inclusion, in addition to being more negatively affected by most disincentives, than those with non-developmental disabilities.** That is, specific incentives encourage placement of a particular type of disability into the regular classroom. This type of disability is frequently the student with developmental disabilities. This same type of student is more negatively affected by most disincentives to inclusion.

5. **Students with disabilities at the elementary and secondary levels of education generally receive equal consideration for inclusion into the general education classroom.** If there is any bias toward any level of education, it is the elementary level. West Virginia principals indicated that for certain types of incentives and disincentives for inclusion, students at the elementary level were more likely to be affected. In contrast, special educators in West Virginia and across the nation generally indicated equal impact on all grade levels.

6. **Important factors that create incentives for inclusion are generally the same across all funding formula groups for in-state programs, but not for residential programs.** Important factors that create incentives for inclusion within in-state programs include a strong school system philosophy for inclusion, strong advocacy efforts, and Federal regulations. West Virginia respondents added a fourth category - specialized training/education of teachers.

7. **Major impacts of inclusion of students with disabilities into the general education classroom include increased social integration, increased positive expectations on the part of teachers, and increased negative expectations on the part of teachers.** These outcomes were similar across funding formula groups, including West Virginia respondents.

8. The experience of six model states in inclusion indicated 10 funding practices and related policies important for inclusion. These are listed below in decreasing order of importance:

(1) Development and implementation of a broad philosophy supporting inclusion,
(2) Collaboration and mutual training for both general and special education teachers,
(3) Presence of fiscal incentive programs that encourage pilots that focus on developing effective models for inclusion,
(4) Academic instruction supplemented by community-based instructions and experiences,
(5) Local schools held responsible for learning outcomes of the students,
(6) Funding that follows the student to provide for individualized service needs,
(7) Eliminating or decreasing the separation of funding streams represented by special education and general education,
(8) Elimination of categorical labels,
(9) Fiscal incentives to bring back individuals from residential placements that include wrap-around funding practices, and
(10) Services that are reimbursed, rather than counting the number of students.

An additional important consideration included involving representatives of all the important stakeholder groups for the up-front planning of inclusion efforts, in addition to maintaining their involvement through on-going meetings to address problems that arise and celebrate successes. These stake holders include principals, superintendents of general education, teachers (special education and general education), parents and advocates, board, special education coordinators, state director of special education, legislative representatives, business and community representatives.

Recommendations for Funding Practices in West Virginia

A. Funding Practices

1. **Develop funding practices for providing services that focus on the services needs of the individual student, rather than student count or type of disability .** Categorization acted as a significant disincentive to inclusion, and therefore should be elimintated in any new funding formula that is developed. A type of funding formula that would fall within the Formula 2: pupil weighting system should be developed that would focus on the service needs of individual students without the necessity of labeling the type of disability. However, do not go to a strictly hourly system of reimbursement for services needed; it may encourage growth of hours of service. Rather contract for a large span of time such as one-half day.

2. **Change the funding formula AFTER one to two years of intensive experimentation and evaluation of results.** During this experimentation period, the restrictions of the old funding formula can be managed through providing funding initiatives

(pilots), in addition to making some changes in the old formula such as incentives that encourage placement into special education classrooms such as lower class size.

3. **Merge the operation of funding streams** but keep the separate sources of funding for these financial streams, e.g., local tax base for general education, federal and state monies for special education. Do this through encouraging mutually agreed upon ways of mixing and matching funds for individual students, and increasing the collaborative planning and decision-making between special education and general education.

4. **Provide enough money and resources for the effort that you have in mind.** Three out of the six model states overextended their efforts. The result was frequent comments about not enough money or resources, slow progress, resistance and lots of fear.

5. **Develop funding practices that encourage the inclusion of students with severe disabilities to stay within their home school through the use of wrap-around funding for special services outside of the school system.** Establish partnerships with local services providers and agencies outside of the school system that could provide the special services that ordinarily would demand residential school placement.

6. **Start small!** Don't spread your efforts evenly over the entire state; instead pick a certain number of schools as magnet schools over a three year period. Provide incentive funding for intensive piloting over time to develop model funding initiatives and related policies within the parameters of the state philosophy and plan.

7. **Develop a substantial discretionary fund that can provide for funding of pilot projects, provide for intensive teacher training, and make available specialized services for severe disabilities.**

B. Related Policies

1. **At the state level, gather together representatives of all the important stakeholder groups.** These stakeholders should include the following listed in order of importance:
(1) principals
(2) superintendent of general education
(3) teachers
(4) parents and advocates
(5) board
(6) special education coordinators
(7) state director of special education
(8) legislative representatives
(9) business and community representatives

With this group, further develop the plan for inclusion and review the mission and vision statements so that they inspire and excite a belief and commitment to inclusion. Have this group meet on a regular basis to determine the success of the strategies at both a state and local level.

2. **Have schools and districts follow-up the state-wide planning, with local community planning sessions** that consist of a similar broad-based representation of stakeholders as indicated for state-wide planning. The purpose of the local planning sessions should be to help implement the state-wide plan, in addition to forming a local philosophy and vision that complements the state's philosophy. This develops ownership, models collaboration, and ensures more organized and discrete implementation of the state philosophy of integration.

3. **Develop written policies and guidelines AFTER ironing out the approach** to inclusion through a year long series of pilot initiatives. Keep the policies and guidelines simple and flexible.

4. **Provide an organized program of training and technical assistance** to those who are implementing the inclusion program. Do this through a needs assessment of participants. Provide a supplemental program of P.R. that provides information to the local community about what is being done.

5. **Develop a system of communication** within the state, that provides for a variety of means to reach people, such as face-to-face meetings, mailings, videos, E-mail, training. Through this system, encourage the flow of communication upward in addition to downward. Poor communication is one of the most frequent barriers mentioned by the six model states.

6. **Avoid a style of leadership that is solely hierarchical and authoritarian.** According to the experience of the six model states, it discourages experimentation, motivation and commitment of participants.

7. **Develop teacher support teams** for inclusion within each building.

8. **Work on changing attitudes and beliefs that act as barriers to inclusion** through involving key players in planning and implementation, creating successful demonstration sites, surfacing and discussing underlying values and beliefs about integration in parent and teacher support groups. Negative attitudes and beliefs is the MOST frequent barrier to successful inclusion programs according to the model states' experiences.

9. **Develop a philosophy that includes core beliefs essential to developing effective inclusion programs.** These beliefs should be discussed frequently at the state and local levels and used as criteria against which success in inclusion is judged. Essential core beliefs include:

o all students are unique and have different learning styles,
o students need opportunities to learn that maximize potential,
o teachers must meet students at their level and help them to grow,
o all students can learn,
o all students have worth,
o educate students for the future,
o develop lifelong learners.

10. **Carefully plan all related policies that are attempted since these policies tend to be more critical to the success of an inclusion program than funding practices.** The experience of the six model states kept emphasizing the importance of related policies, rather than the particular funding formula or overall funding practices. There was certainly overall concern about having enough money to fund program attempts. But concern over specific funding practices seemed lower in importance than consideration such as developing a dynamic philosophy that incorporated critical core beliefs that would drive program development.

RESEARCH FINDINGS
Personnel Practices

Research Questions

1. **What effects do current personnel practices in the West Virginia Department of Education, the West Virginia Office of Special Education and high education have on all school personnel in regard to facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular education system.**

2. What effects do current personnel practices in state departments of education, offices of special education and higher education across the nation have on school personnel in regard to facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular education system?

3. What are the characteristics and effects of exemplary programs that have personnel practices that effectively facilitate the inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom?

Method

Overview

To answer these questions two surveys (one for teachers and one for administrators) were created that addressed the following areas of personnel practices:

1. certification requirements for special education and general education at the teacher and administrative levels, and their impact on inclusion of students with disabilities into the general education classroom,
2. special teaching permits and their effect on inclusion,
3. description of preservice curriculum options in both general education and special education at both the teacher and administrative levels and the impact on inclusion practices,
4. description of special education and general education inservice options at both the teacher and administrative levels, and the impact of these options on inclusion,
5. description of best practices at both the teacher and administrative levels generated from previous research and the literature, and their effect on inclusion practices,
6. a description of the barriers to inclusion encountered by both teachers and administrators, and their importance, and
7. description of ideal characteristics for higher education faculty educating teachers and school administrators.

The surveys were piloted, and then revised based on the feedback given by pilot participants. See Appendix B for the completed teacher and administrator surveys for personnel practices.

In West Virginia, administrator surveys were sent to 100 public school principals equally divided between elementary and secondary levels who were involved in inclusion practices.

Their names were randomly selected from a list of principals in West Virginia who were said to be in schools where inclusion was taking place to a greater or lesser degree. Each of the principals was asked to choose one special education teacher and one general education teacher within their building, and request that they fill out a teacher survey. Administrator surveys were also sent to the state director of special education and all coordinators of special education.

TWO SURVEYS - TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS:

- ***Certification Practices***
- ***Preservice Curriculum***
- ***Best Teacher Practices***
- ***Best Administrator Practices***
- ***Inservice Options***
- ***Barriers to Inclusion***
- ***Higher Education Faculty and Inclusion***

For the remaining states, administrator surveys were sent to the state director of special education, the superintendent of general education, 10 school principals involved in inclusion and five special education coordinators. Each of the 10 school principals was requested to distribute the teacher survey to one general education teacher in their building and one special education teacher.

A 21% return rate for teacher surveys, and a 26% return rate for administrator surveys was obtained. 256 teachers responded and 251 administrators nation wide. Out of this number, were 38 teachers from West Virginia and 33 administrators.

In regard to certification area, 112 special education administrators responded and 137 in general education. For teachers, there were 106 in general education and 150 in special education. There were more elementary teachers responding than secondary, while for administrators there were more responsible for all levels of education than primary or secondary.

To determine five model states, the top three administrative and teaching practices important to inclusion were determined from the responses on the two surveys. The top three personnel practices were determined in the following categories: certification, best practices, pre-service education, and inservice training. The presence of each of these practices were determined for each state using a 90% criterion.

For each category indicating presence within the state, a score of 3 was given for one personnel practice present in the category, an additional two points for the presence of a second top personnel practice, and one more point for the presence of the third. A score of six could, therefore, be obtained for the presence of all three top personnel practices in one

category. The scores for each category were added. The states displaying the highest frequency of these practices in each category were identified as model states. The choices of models states were then compared to verbal input from experts in the field who had been questioned about states displaying model personnel practices for inclusion. Based on these two factors, frequency of practices and expert input, the final decision was made in regard to model states.

A structured telephone interview was developed that focused on getting more indepth information about the most important personnel practices that had been identified from the survey. At least five individuals in each state were interviewed All interviewees were either at the building level, or were area coordinators. There was an equal focus between administrators and teachers. However, there was more emphasis on obtaining building level input, because the focus was on how personnel practices important to inclusion were operating on an everyday basis.

Analysis

Survey questions, where respondents were asked to choose their answers from a listing of options provided, were analyzed through the use of crosstabulation - multiple response analysis. Frequencies and percents were obtained for responses across teachers and administrators for each of the options provided on each question. Throughout this report, data will be displayed in the resulting multiple response tables for easy viewing of results. No inferential statistics were done and, therefore, solely descriptive analysis forms the basis for the reported results.

For both the survey and structured interview questions that were open-ended, a content analysis was done to determine recurring themes across respondents for each question. Two researchers independently identified recurring themes and then compared results. Common categories were identified and agreed upon, and then the frequency of response for each of the categories determined.

Survey Results: Personnel Practices

Certification Practices
Teacher Survey Question 1: Teacher Certification

For this question, a list of teacher certification practices was sent to a certification specialist in each state. The specialist was asked to indicate whether the particular practice listed were ***present*** within their state system. At the same time, teachers were asked to indicate how ***important*** the listed certification practices were for inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom, regardless of their presence or absence in their state. Teachers were provided with the scale shown below to rate the importance of each practice. Further,

additional important certification practices not listed could be added by using a space labeled, *Other*. If teachers did this, they were asked to judge the importance of each practice they added.

1 = no to little importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
2 = medium level importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
3 = high importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities

Ratings of three, high importance for inclusion, were tabulated and analyzed.* A similar analysis was done for *Presence* data. *The results for both the Presence and Importance focus can be seen in Table 1.The most important certification practices are indicated in bold.

In the table, under the *Presence* category, the "States" columns indicates the rank and frequency of each certification practice over all states except West Virginia. The frequency represents the number of states indicating the practice is present in their state. The ranks are therefore indicating the most frequent certification practices present nationwide. Those practices present in West Virginia are indicated under "WV" with Y = yes it is present, N = no it is not present.

Under the *Importance* section of the table, the *States* category indicates the overall rank of each certification practice for all states except West Virginia. The columns underneath indicate responses for *Overall* response patterns, *General Education* teachers, *Special Education*, and teachers who have certification in *Both* areas. A similar set of columns can be seen under the category labeled, *West Virginia*, indicating overall response patterns and teacher responses from that state. West Virginia respondents from special education indicated they had certification in both general education and special education. Therefore, the *Both* column is used to indicate the responses of WV special education teachers.

Presence and importance of teacher certification practices. Table 1 indicates that the most frequently Present certification practices in West Virginia and across the nation were field experiences in general and special education. The most highly Important certification practices for inclusion overall were:

1. ***Those practices relating to field experience in general and special education, in addition to***
2. ***State standards that demanded certain required competencies such as behavior management or different learning characteristics of special students.***

Most states including West Virginia required field experiences in special and general education for their teachers. However, in regard to requirement of certain competencies, less than half of the states (22 including West Virginia) indicated this certification requirement. ***This means that there is a real discrepancy in certification standards for over half of the states between the demand by state certification personnel to have these type of competencies be present in teachers' experiences, and the necessity that they be present to aid inclusion. That is demand is less than it should be to adequately facilitate inclusion.***

PRACTICE	PRESENCE		IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUSION						
			STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	States	WV	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. **Field experience with general education students**	1 (48)	Y	2 (149)	1 (67)	3 (25)	2 (57)	2 (25)	1 (8)	3 (16)
B. **Field experience with special education students**	2 (46)	Y	1 (170)	1 (67)	1 (35)	1 (68)	1 (27)	2 (7)	1 (19)
C. Update certification with additional credit hrs.	4 (32)	Y	7 (46)	7 (16)	6 (8)	6 (22)	4 (13)	6 (1)	4 (12)
D. College degree or certification in general and special education	4 (32)	Y	5 (102)	3 (40)	4 (19)	4 (43)	3 (18)	3 (5)	4 (12)
E. College degree in special education that is non-categorical	5 (31)	Y	4 (103)	4 (37)	3 (25)	5 (41)	5 (11)	4 (3)	5 (8)
F. College degree in special education that is categorical	6 (26)	N	9 (34)	8 (13)	8 (5)	8 (16)	6 (10)	5 (2)	6 (7)
G. **Standards include required competencies such as behavior management or different learning characteristics of special students**	7 (21)	Y	3 (127)	2 (52)	2 (29)	3 (46)	2 (25)	1 (8)	2 (17)
H. Standards allow hire of uncertified personnel to critical shortage areas.	3 (36)	Y	8 (45)	6 (20)	5 (9)	8 (16)	7 (7)	4 (3)	7 (4)
I Standards allow alternate routes for certification other than college degree.	6 (26)	Y	6 (49)	5 (22)	7 (7)	7 (20)	8 (5)	6 (1)	8 (3)
J. OTHER: experience in schools using inclusion	8 (12)	N	10 (20)	9 (6)	9 (4)	9 (10)	9 (3)	— (0)	9 (3)

TABLE 1. Certification Practices for Teachers - Teacher Response

Factors that could affect ratings of importance. In general, the rankings of the important teacher certification practices are similar across all types of certification (general education, special education, both). Moreover, West Virginia responses are highly similar to teachers from other states. This means that the type of certification practices that are highly important to inclusion remain the same regardless of type of certification or particular state. Similarly, from an analysis of level of teaching (elementary or secondary), it is clear that the type of certification practices important to inclusion do not vary significantly from elementary to secondary level. ***Thus, the importance of the ranked certification practices for inclusion does not essentially change across type of certification, level of teaching or particular state.***

Although differences in type of certification generally do not affect importance rankings for teacher certification, there is one exception that should be noted. For certification practice H, standards that allow hire of uncertified personnel to critical shortage areas, general education teachers in both West Virginia and the States, in addition to special education teachers in the States, appear to feel this is a moderately important practice for inclusion. In contrast, under both the STATES and WV categories, teachers with dual certification in general education and special education see this as a practice is of lesser importance. ***Perhaps teachers not dually certified feel themselves to be more limited in their ability to deal with either special or general education students within the regular classroom when dealing with inclusion. They, therefore, see a need for help within the classroom from an additional teacher, or the need to reduce class size through hiring additional teachers.***

Certification Practices
Administrator Survey Question 1:
Teacher Certification

Administrators were asked to rank the importance of these same teacher certification practices for inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom. ***The results can be seen in Table 2 with the most important certification displayed in bold.*** The frequencies displayed represent a tabulation of administrator ratings of 3, high importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities. The categories and format remain the same as that seen in the previous table.

As indicated in Table 2, the overall administrator rankings of importance for certain teacher certification practices essential for inclusion are identical to teacher rankings. Further, just as with the teacher response, the type of certification and level of teaching generally does not affect the importance rating of these certification practices. West Virginia's responses are highly similar to the responses from the other states.

Specific certification standards: WV Teachers vs. WV Administrators. **For certification practice C**, update certification with additional credit hours, West Virginia special education administrators seem to feel this practice is of far lesser importance than special education teachers in the same state. Administrators scores of importance resulted in a

PRACTICE	PRESENCE States	WV	IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUSION STATES Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	WEST VIRGINIA Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. **Field experience with general education students**	1 (48)	Y	2 (155)	2 (72)	1 (30)	3 (53)	2 (24)	1 (13)	2 (9)
B. **Field experience with special education students**	2 (46)	Y	1 (172)	1 (73)	1 (30)	1 (69)	1 (26)	1 (13)	1 (11)
C. Update certification with additional credit hrs.	4 (32)	Y	7 (54)	7 (21)	5 (11)	6 (22)	7 (6)	5 (5)	7 (1)
D. College degree or certification in general and special education	4 (32)	Y	5 (88)	4 (41)	4 (15)	5 (32)	4 (16)	3 (7)	4 (7)
E. College degree in special education that is non-categorical	5 (31)	Y	4 (101)	5 (37)	3 (22)	4 (42)	5 (14)	6 (4)	3 (8)
F. College degree in special education that is categorical	6 (26)	N	10 (24)	8 (16)	8 (2)	9 (6)	6 (9)	4 (6)	5 (3)
G. **Standards include required competencies such as behavior management or different learning characteristics of special students**	7 (21)	Y	3 (152)	3 (56)	2 (28)	2 (68)	3 (20)	2 (10)	3 (8)
H. Standards allow hire of uncertified personnel to critical shortage areas.	3 (36)	Y	8 (36)	7 (21)	7 (6)	8 (9)	8 (5)	7 (2)	5 (3)
I Standards allow alternate routes for certification other than college degree.	6 (26)	Y	6 (55)	6 (25)	6 (8)	6 (22)	10 (3)	8 (1)	6 (2)
J. OTHER: experience in schools using inclusion	7 (12)	N	9 (32)	9 (11)	7 (6)	7 (15)	9 (4)	8 (1)	6 (2)

TABLE 2. Certification Practices for Teachers - Administator Response

ranking of 7, while teachers scores resulted in a ranking of 4. ***Perhaps special education teachers in West Virginia, in contrast to administrators, see more of a need to continuously upgrade the skills of teachers engaged in inclusion practices.***

Similarly, ***for certification practice H,*** the responses of West Virginia general education teachers on this part of the survey indicate a moderate importance ranking of 4 for being able to hire uncertified personnel to cover critical shortage areas. West Virginia administrators in general education, in contrast, display a ranking of 7 for this same practice. ***Thus, it may be that general education teachers feel more of a need to gain additional teacher support when practicing inclusion than do administrators or special education teachers.***

Certification Practices
Administrator Survey Question 2:
Administrator Certification

This question focused on certification practices for administrators in public schools. Both the presence of the certification standards and their importance for inclusion were rated. Specialist in certification were sent a listing of certification standards for public school administrators. They were asked to indicate the presence or absence of the listed certification standards, and then were given the option of adding additional standards that were important in administrator certification.

Simultaneously, the survey asked administrators to rate the listed certification practices by using the three point Likert scale shown below:

1 = no to little importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
2 = medium level importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
3 = high importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities

As in the previous survey question, the frequency of high importance (# 3) for each of the certification practices was tabulated and analyzed. ***The results for both Presence and Importance data can be seen in Table 3. The most important overall administrator certification practices are indicated in bold.*** The categories and format are the same as in the previous two tables, with the exception that the *Practices* column now reflect Administrative certification practices.

Importance* and *Presence* of administrator certification practices** ***The most frequently Present administrator certification practices indicated in Table 3 are:

1. Demanding a specific number of years of teaching experience,
2. The requirements of a college degree or certification in public school administration, and
3. State standards that include certain required competencies such as knowledge of personnel problems.

PRACTICE	PRESENCE		IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUSION						
			STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	States	WV	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. Specifc number of years of teaching experience	1 (47)	Y	6 (78)	4 (39)	4 (11)	6 (28)	4 (15)	2 (8)	3 (5)
B. Internship in public school administration.	5 (34)	Y	5 (80)	5 (37)	3 (12)	5 (31)	6 (11)	4 (4)	2 (6)
C. The demand to update certification with additional credit hours.	4 (35)	Y	7 (57)	7 (23)	5 (9)	7 (25)	7 (8)	4 (4)	4 (4)
D. **College degree or certification in general education.**	6 (28)	N	4 (105)	2 (60)	3 (12)	4 (33)	1 (18)	1 (10)	2 (6)
E. **College degree or certification in public school administration.**	2 (38)	Y	2 (114)	1 (63)	3 (12)	3 (39)	2 (17)	1 (10)	3 (5)
F. **Certification or some coursework in special education.**	7 (23)	N	3 (110)	6 (34)	2 (24)	1 (52)	3 (16)	4 (4)	1 (10)
G. **State standards that include certain required competencies, e.g., knowledge of personnel problems.**	3 (36)	Y	1 (122)	3 (46)	1 (25)	2 (51)	5 (14)	3 (6)	2 (6)
H.OTHER: Predominant write in response focused on training in how to manage inclusion programs.	8 (8)	N	8 (23)	8 (5)	6 (7)	8 (11)	8 (3)	5 (0)	5 (2)

TABLE 3. Certification Practices for Administrators -Type of Certification

The most Important overall certification practices for States respondents were:

1. State standards that include certain required competencies such as knowledge of personnel problems,
2. College degree or certification in public school administration, and
3. Certification or some coursework in special education.

For West Virginia, the most Important overall certification practices differed only slightly from States respondents. Instead of (1) listed above, respondents substituted college degree or certification in general education as the most important of their top three practices listed. The remaining practices were the same as listed in (2) and (3) above for States. In regard to *Presence* of administrator certification practices in West Virginia, all listed practices were required with the exception of a college degree in general education, or certification in special education.

Specific certification practices across type of certification. For *States* respondents, the rankings listed for general education certification practices differ from that seen for special education and "both" categories. For general educator administrators, the top important certification practices are listed as E, D while for special educators and those dually certified G, F are indicated.

For *West Virginia* respondents, a similar pattern is present. That is, for general educator administrators the top ranked certification practices included D and E (tied), followed by A and G in importance, while for those certified in special education and general education, top ranked practices included F followed by G, B, D (tied). ***Therefore, type of certification plays an important part in the choice of specific administrator certification practices judged to be important for managing inclusion programs.***

Level of Administrator Focus. The level of administrator focus, primary level, secondary level or both, was analyzed. Ratings of importance that were identified as 3 (high importance) were tabulated. *The level of administrator focus does not drastically alter the importance of administrator certification practices for inclusion for any of the states.*

Preservice Education

Teacher Survey Question 2: Teacher Preservice Education

This question focused on having teachers describe the types of preservice training they had received, in addition to rating the importance of certain preservice curriculum areas for inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom. Teachers were provided with an extensive listing of preservice curriculum areas that were obtained from scanning special education and general education curriculums from various professional associations and university programs. (See appendix B, teacher survey for the entire listing).

Teachers were asked to indicate the *Presence* of each of the listed curriculum areas within their college study program. They were also instructed to use the rating scale below to indicate the importance of each of the curriculum areas listed for inclusion regardless of whether it was present within their training program. To provide for additional important areas not listed, an *Other* category was provided where teachers could write-in additional curriculum areas important to inclusion.

1 = no to little importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
2 = medium importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
3 = high importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities

Ratings of high importance (#3) for each of the listed curriculum areas were tabulated and analyzed. The frequency of teachers indicating the *presence* of the same curriculum areas within their educational experience was also tabulated. ***Results can be see in Table 5 for the States and in Table 6 for West Virginia on the next two pages. Those preservice knowledge areas most Important to inclusion practices are indicated in bold.***

In the tables, preservice areas are listed on the left. On the right, the *importance and presence* categories provide rankings and frequencies (in parentheses) for these preservice areas. The rankings for the *Importance* category indicate how essential each of the preservice education areas is for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom. When a rank is tied there are small letters beside the tied numbers. Under the *Presence* category, ranks indicate the frequency of receiving the listed educational experiences within teacher college training programs. The frequencies indicated in parenthesis for both categories display the number of respondents. Under each category, columns address (1) overall scores for importance and presence, in addition to comparison of responses for specific teacher certification areas of (2) general education, (3) special education, and (4) dual certification (Both).

***Importance* and *Presence* of teachers preservice areas.** For *West Virginia*, as well as the remaining states the most *important* overall preservice areas for facilitating inclusion practices were:

(1) F: planning and managing the teaching/learning environment for maximum learning,
(2) C: characteristics of learners such as learning styles and theory,
(3) G: communication and collaborative partnerships (last two are tied for third place).

However, West Virginia added at fourth preservice area to this selection by virtue of a tied rank for third place. This preservice area was E: assessment and evaluation skills in constructing, giving and interpreting test.

The most frequently *present* overall preservice areas in the educational training provided to teachers were:

PRESERVICE EDUCATION AREAS	IMPORTANCE Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	PRESENCE Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both
A. Philosophical, historical and legal foundations of education.	11 (85)	10 (41)	10 (13)	9 (31)	2 (186)	3 (74)	3 (36)	2a (76)
B. Social considerations such as cultural differences and beliefs; language development.	8 (134)	5 (57)	7 (27)	7 (50)	9 (123)	7 (46)	9 (24)	8 (53)
C. **Characteristics of learners such as learning styles and theory.**	3 (179)	3 (74)	3 (35)	2 (70)	1 (199)	1 (83)	1 (39)	1 (77)
D. Curriculum and instruction skills such as design and eval. of instructional programs.	5 (152)	4a (64)	5a (30)	4a (58)	3 (174)	2 (81)	8a (30)	7 (63)
E. Assessment and evaluation skills in constructing, giving, and interpreting tests.	9 (124)	8 (51)	9 (17)	5 (56)	4 (170)	4 (64)	2 (37)	3 (69)
F. **Planning and managing the teaching/learning environment for maximum learning.**	2 (186)	1 (77)	2 (37)	1a (72)	5 (160)	5 (60)	5 (34)	4a (66)
G. **Communication and collaborative partnerships.**	1 (188)	2 (75)	1 (41)	1b (72)	11 (79)	9 (31)	10 (13)	9 (35)
H. Knowledge of exceptional learners: etiology, characteristics, social aspects, medical aspects.	4 (153)	4b (64)	5b (30)	3 (59)	7 (144)	8 (33)	4 (35)	2b (76)
I. Issues specific to exceptional learners such as legal aspects, community services available.	10 (102)	9 (43)	8 (22)	8 (37)	8 (125)	10 (28)	7 (32)	5 (65)
J. Educational considerations for exceptional learners such as task analysis, behavior control.	7 (141)	7 (53)	4 (33)	6 (55)	10 (120)	11 (24)	8b (30)	4b (66)
K. Ethical practices and professionalism (student teaching).	6 (142)	6 (55)	6 (29)	4b (58)	6 (149)	6 (52)	6 (33)	6 (64)
L. OTHER: primary write-in response: peer tutoring principles.	12 (7)	11 (1)	11 (3)	10 (3)	12 (1)	12 (0)	11 (0)	10 (1)

TABLE 5. Teacher Preservice Education Areas Important To Inclusion: The States

PRESERVICE EDUCATION AREAS	IMPORTANCE Overall	General Educ.	Both	PRESENCE Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. Philosophical, historical and legal foundations of education.	9 (15)	5a (4)	7 (11)	2 (31)	2 (8)	2 (21)
B. Social considerations such as cultural differences and beliefs; language development.	8 (17)	5b (4)	6 (13)	6a (21)	4a (6)	7 (13)
C. **Characteristics of learners such as learning styles and theory**	2 (31)	1 (11)	2 (20)	1 (35)	1 (11)	1 (22)
D. Curriculum and instruction skills such as design and eval. of instructional programs.	4a (25)	3a (8)	3a (17)	4 (26)	3 (7)	5a (17)
E. **Assessment and evaluation skills in constructing, giving, and interpreting tests.**	3a (26)	2a (10)	4 (16)	3 (27)	4b (6)	3 (19)
F. **Planning and managing the teaching/learning environment for maximum learning.**	1 (32)	2b (10)	1 (21)	5 (25)	4c (6)	5b (17)
G. **Communication and collaborative partnerships.**	3b (26)	3b (8)	3b (17)	10 (11)	6a (0)	8 (9)
H. Knowledge of exceptional learners: etiology, characteristics, social aspects, medical aspects.	4b (25)	3c (8)	3c (17)	7 (20)	5a (1)	5c (17)
I. Issues specific to exceptional learners such as legal aspects, community services available.	6 (19)	5c (4)	5a (14)	9 (16)	6b (0)	6a (14)
J. Educational considerations for exceptional learners such as task analysis, behavior control.	7 (18)	6 (3)	5b (14)	8 (17)	5b (1)	6b (14)
K. Ethical practices and professionalism (student teaching).	5 (21)	4 (7)	5c (14)	6b (21)	5c (1)	4 (18)
L. OTHER: primary write-in response: peer tutoring principles.	10 (2)	7 (0)	8 (2)	11 (0)	6c (0)	9 (0)

TABLE 6. Teacher Preservice Education Areas Important To Inclusion: West Virginia

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1) C: characteristics of learners such as learning styles and theory,
(2) A: philosophical, historical and legal foundations of education, and
(3) D: curriculum and instruction skills such as design and evaluation of instructional programs.

The most frequent service areas present in the educational experience of West Virginia teachers were identical with the exception of the deleting D as a choice and adding in E. This preservice area focuses on assessment and evaluation skills in constructing, giving and interpreting tests.

With the exception of C and E , the top three categories of Importance compared to Presence do not match for West Virginia teachers as well as teachers from other states. This indicates a mismatch between those areas of preservice education important to facilitating inclusion, and the availability of such training and experience at a preservice level.

Specific differences in *Importance* of preservice areas compared to *Presence* across type of certification. ***Preservice area B:*** This area addresses social considerations such as knowledge of our own cultural beliefs and assumptions, cultural differences and language development. As we grow toward a more diverse nation, there is a beginning realization that we not only need to accept and appreciate individuals from other cultures, but also must become more mindful of the beliefs and assumptions that drive our everyday behavior learned from our family and national culture. (Lager, 1989). There is also a realization, that those from different cultures may bring to the classroom different learning styles of which teachers are often unaware (Lynch and Hanson, 1992).

It appears that for general education teachers from West Virginia and the remaining states, there is a beginning realization of the importance of this area to learning in an inclusive classroom. For teachers in the States category and those from West Virginia, this area was ranked 5. This was less the case for teachers in special education. For those responding from West Virginia the rank was 6, and for those from the rest of the nation the rank was 7 for those certified in special education or dually certified. Nonetheless, for both this signifies at least a medium level recognition of the importance of this area.

However, the frequency of experience to exposure to this important area in college training programs indicates a discrepancy. That is, there is a discrepancy between indicated importance of this area and the availability of training in it within preservice programs for special education teachers and those dually certified across the nation. The presence of this area in their preservice education was ranked 9 and 8 respectively. In the general education area, there appears to have been somewhat more exposure to this curriculum area with a rank of 7.

In West Virginia, special education teachers indicate also indicated a rank of 7 for exposure to the social considerations area. But tied scores prior to this rank artificially inflated it. That is, if there had been no tied scores, the rank would also have been 9, thus indicating less

exposure than there should be to this area. In contrast to special education teachers, the ranking for general education teachers in West Virginia for exposure to the social considerations area in their preservice education is 4. ***The conclusion is that for teachers in both general and special education nationwide, as well as special education in West Virginia, there has been an underexposure to cultural and language development principles that are important to learning in an inclusive classroom.***

Preservice area F - planning and managing an classroom environment for maximum learning: As discussed earlier, for teachers in general education and special education across the nation and in West Virginia, this area was ranked as one of *the most important* for education in an inclusive classroom. Yet, the presence of exposure to principles that address this area in their preservice education is mediocre, as indicated by ranks of 5 across the board.

Preservice area G - communication and collaborative partnerships: As indicated previously, for teachers across the nation, including those from West Virginia, ***this area was ranked among the top three important knowledge areas for successfully running an inclusion program. Yet, looking at the presence of preservice education in this area, ranks are consistently last (10 and 11 overall), indicating a significant lack of knowledge in an area crucial to inclusion.***

Preservice area H - knowledge of exceptional learner characteristics: General education teachers in both the States category and West Virginia indicated this knowledge area to be important to successful inclusion programs. Yet the presence of this knowledge through preservice educational backgrounds has clearly not been present to any great degree for most of these teachers. Therefore, there is again a discrepancy between skills that are needed to make an inclusion program work, and the presence of those skills in the teachers that are trying to struggle with this new philosophy.

Teacher preservice education and level of focus. An analysis was done for the preservice area categorizing responses across primary level teachers, secondary level teachers, and those focused across all grade levels. There was no visible effect of level of focus on the type of preservice education area indicated as important to inclusion for West Virginia or the remaining states.

Would teacher ratings of importance for preservice areas differ if only considering inclusion of students with developmental disabilities?
No: 239, Yes: 11.

Preservice Education
Administrator Survey Question 3:
Administrator Preservice Education

This question focused on preservice education areas specific to public school administrators. Administrators involved in managing inclusion programs were asked to indicate whether the

specific preservice education areas of learning that were listed on the survey were part of their college program of studies. Further, regardless of whether the preservice area was present in their background of experience, administrators were also asked to indicate the importance of these preservice areas for making inclusion programs successful in the public school system.

For the latter case, administrators were asked to use the scale below to indicate the degree of importance for inclusion programs. To provide for additional important areas not listed, an *Other* category was provided where administrators could write-in additional preservice areas important to inclusion.

1 = no to little importance for facilitating inclusion of students with disabilities
2 = medium importance for facilitating inclusion of students with disabilities
3 = high importance for facilitating inclusion of students with disabilities

Ratings of high importance (#3) for each of the listed preservice areas were tabulated. The frequency of administrators indicating the *presence* of the same preservice areas within their educational experience was also tabulated. ***The results can be seen in Table 7 for administrators from all states except West Virginia, and Table 8 for administrators from West Virginia. Preservice areas of highest importance to inclusion are displayed in bold.***

In the tables, preservice areas are listed on the left. On the right, the *importance and presence* categories provide rankings and frequencies (in parentheses) for these preservice areas. The rankings for the importance category indicate how essential each of the preservice education areas is for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom. If the ranks were tied, small letters are beside each of the tied rankings. Under the presence category, ranks indicate the frequency of receiving the listed educational experiences within administrator college training programs. The frequencies indicated in parenthesis for both categories display the number of respondents. Under each category, columns address (1) overall scores for importance and presence, in addition to comparison of responses for specific administrator certification areas, (2) general education, (3) special education, and (4) dual certification (Both).

Importance and presence of administrator preservice areas. For administrators from all states except West Virginia, the top three preservice education areas *Important* to inclusion were:

1. ***C: principles of curriculum development such as curriculum planning, principles for selection and organization of content, current trends in design,***
2. ***B: social considerations such as cultural differences and beliefs; contemporary social issues,***
3. ***E: management practices such as administrative procedures, organizational management, school surveys, personnel problems, school-community relations, student activities, schedule making, internal financial accounting, and supervision.***

PRESERVICE EDUCATION AREAS	IMPORTANCE				PRESENCE			
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both
A. Philosophical, historical and legal foundations of education.	5 (76)	5 (35)	4 (15)	5 (26)	1 (183)	1 (81)	1 (34)	1 (68)
B. **Social considerations such as cultural differences and beliefs; contemporary social issues.**	2 (144)	2 (62)	2a (26)	2 (56)	5 (119)	5 (53)	4 (18)	5 (48)
C. **Principles of curriculum development such as curriculum planning, principles for selection and organization of content, current trends in design.**	1 (173)	1 (82)	1 (32)	1 (59)	2 (169)	2 (80)	2a (27)	2 (62)
D. Education policy such as policy making in education from planning to evaluation with emphasis on the identification of policy problems, organizational decision processes and policy formation, examination of relationships among educational policy, values and social changes.	4 (110)	4 (49)	3 (24)	4 (37)	4 (143)	4 (65)	3 (25)	4 (53)
E. **Management practices such as administrative procedures, organizational management, school surveys, personnel problems, school-community relations, student activities, schedule making, internal financial accounting, supervision.**	3 (134)	3 (61)	2b (26)	3 (47)	3 (160)	3 (74)	2b (27)	3 (59)
F. OTHER: primary write-in response: how to manage a program for inclusion of students with disabilities	6 (29)	6 (7)	5 (11)	6 (11)	6 (9)	6 (2)	5 (4)	6 (3)

TABLE 7. Administrator Preservice Program Areas Important To Inclusion: The States

PRESERVICE EDUCATION AREAS	IMPORTANCE Overall	General Educ.	Both	PRESENCE Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. Philosophical, historical and legal foundations of education.	4 (11)	4a (3)	3 (8)	3 (23)	1 (12)	1a (11)
B. Social considerations such as cultural differences and beliefs; contemporary social issues.	5 (9)	4b (3)	4a (6)	5 (16)	4 (9)	3a (7)
C. **Principles of curriculum development such as curriculum planning, principles for selection and organization of content, current trends in design.**	2 (24)	2 (12)	1 (12)	1 (27)	2a (16)	1b (11)
D. **Education policy such as policy making in education from planning to evaluation with emphasis on the identification of policy problems, organizational decision processes and policy formation, examination of relationships among educational policy, values and social changes.**	3 (13)	3 (7)	4b (6)	4 (18)	3 (11)	3b (7)
E. **Management practices such as administrative processes, organizational management, school surveys, personnel problems, school-community relations, student activities, schedule making, internal financial accounting, supervision.**	1 (25)	1 (14)	2 (11)	2 (24)	2b (14)	2 (10)
F. OTHER: primary write-in response: how to manage a program for inclusion of students with disabilities	6 (3)	5 (0)	5 (3)	6 (2)	5 (0)	4 (2)

TABLE 8. Administrator Preservice Program Areas Important To Inclusion: West Virginia

West Virginia administrators indicated these same choices with the exception of omitting B from their top three choices. Preservice area D was substituted instead. This area focuses on knowledge of how to develop and implement educational policy effectively, especially in how it relates in inclusion.

For both West Virginia and those from other states, preservice areas most frequently experienced (*Present)* by public school administrators involved in inclusion programs were:

1. ***A: philosophical, historical and legal foundations of education,***
2. ***C: principles of curriculum development,***
3. ***E: management practices.***

Presence versus importance. ***Preservice area B*** focuses on social consideration such as cultural differences and beliefs, in addition to contemporary social issues. For administrators from states other than from West Virginia, this area is among the most important for effectively managing and implementing an inclusion program. Yet, this area was the least experienced in regard to the preservice educational background of these administrators. This indicates a discrepancy in knowledge base between what is needed to make inclusion successful, and what is present within the preservice educational experiences of administrators in inclusion programs.

West Virginia vs. the remaining states. West Virginia administrators judged Preservice area B, social considerations, as being only of medium level of importance to facilitating inclusion of students with disabilities in West Virginia. This is distinctly different from that seen in the rest of the nation. Consequently, in regard to being sensitive to cultural assumptions and beliefs that drive everyday behavior, in addition to cultural differences, West Virginia administrators may be less sensitive to these issues than administrators from other states.

Type of certification and level of administrative focus. The impact of type of certification on the Importance and Presence of preservice education areas can be examined by inspecting Tables 7 and 8. It is clear that the ranking of preservice areas remains exactly the same across all types of certification areas. Responses were analyzed across *level of administrative focus (primary level, secondary, or all grades)*. The result was the same - no effect on the ranking of importance or presence of preservice education areas for administrators in public school programs focusing on inclusion.

Would administrator ratings of importance for preservice areas differ if only considering inclusion of students with developmental disabilities?
Yes: 8, No: 237

Preservice Education
Administrator Survey Question 5:
Higher Education Faculty and Inclusion

Administrators were asked to list the three most important characteristics that would describe the ideal training and experience for higher education faculty who provide college preservice programs that effectively support inclusion of students with disabilities. ***Table 9 displays the results of the content analysis for this question for West Virginia and the remaining states. Bold characteristics indicate the most highly desired characteristics***. The numbers under each column indicate the frequency with which the particular content category was mentioned by administrators. West Virginia chose characteristics that were identical to the other states.

Best Practices
Teacher Survey Question 4:
Best Teaching Practices

Best teaching practices for inclusion were obtained from discussion with experts in the field, the previous research study in funding practices, and the NASBE report (1992). These were listed on the survey, and teachers were requested to rate the presence of each of the practices within their school system, in addition to rating their importance to inclusion. To rate the importance of each practice the scale below was provided.

1 = no to little importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
2 = medium importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
3 = high importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities

Responses for both the Presence and Importance of the teaching practices were analyzed. The results of this analysis is displayed in Table 10 for all states other than West Virginia, and Table 11 for West Virginia. The most important teaching best practices for facilitating inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom are indicated in bold.

***Importance* and *Presence* of best teaching practices as rated by teachers.** As can be seen from Tables 10 and 11, best teaching practices important for inclusion were identical for both West Virginia and the other states. These important best practices included:

1. ***A: Excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs,***
2. ***E: Peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom are encouraged,***
3. ***G: Both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class.***

DESIRED FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS FOR INCLUSION	STATES	WEST VIRGINIA	TOTAL
1. **NECESSARY FIELD EXPERIENCE** such as teaching and administrative experiences in the public schools with and without disabilities, experience in inclusive schools.	124	19	143
2. **WORKING COLLABORATIVELY WITH THE SCHOOLS** such as providing technical assistance, help develop curriculum within the local educational agency, help develop instructional teams for inclusion, do field studies, help develop overall inclusion programs.	90	9	99
3. **CONTENT KNOWLEDGE IN EDUCATION** that includes assessment methods, knowledge about disabilities, how to modify the curriculum, knowledge about behavior management, effective strategies for inclusion, knowledge of individual learning styles, alternative teaching strategies.	154	23	177
4. MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT KNOWLEDGE FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS that includes understanding of cultural diversity, collaboration and consultation skills, effective management strategies for inclusion, knowledge of educational laws, effective problem solving approaches.	58	8	66
5. SPECIFIC PERSONAL SKILLS including senstivity to college student learning needs, ability to listen and value input from others including students, philosophical belief that all students can learn, belief in inclusion.	73	6	79
6. SPECIFIC TEACHING STRATEGIES such as providing for brief practicum experiences with different types of disabilities, hands-on practical experiences built into coursework including field experience and case studies.	75	8	83
7. COLLABORATION BETWEEN SPECIAL AND GENERAL EDUC. DEPARTMENTS AT THE COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY LEVEL such as mandating special education courses within general education teacher training, team teaching between departments.	19	2	21
8. BECOME A CUTTING EDGE LEADER THROUGH RESEARCH AND COMMUNICATION ABOUT INCLUSION PRACTICES.	53	5	58

TABLE 9. Ideal Characteristics for Higher Education Faculty for Facilitating Inclusion

TEACHER BEST PRACTICES FOR INCLUSION	IMPORTANCE Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	PRESENCE Overall
A. **Excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs.**	1 (199)	1 (84)	1a (38)	1a (77)	1 (134)
B. If the student does not perform well, there is a philosophy that the teacher has not found the best learning channel, rather than assuming the student isn't motivated.	6 (125)	7 (47)	4 (29)	5 (49)	6 (89)
C. Learning outcomes are clearly defined for studnets at all levels with or without disabilities.	5 (160)	5 (70)	3 (30)	4 (60)	2 (129)
D. Opportunities for student self-determination is a priority where both students with and without disabilities are given practice in the roles they must play in society; this includes values clarification.	7 (120)	6 (54)	5 (19)	6 (47)	7 (58)
E. **Peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom are encouraged.**	3 (171)	4 (72)	2a (33)	2 (66)	4 (106)
F. There is an emphasis not on being normal, but rather on individual student enrichment and fulfillment, e.g., self-actualization.	4 (168)	3 (74)	2b (33)	3 (61)	5 (98)
G. **Both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class.**	2 (198)	2 (83)	1b (38)	1b (77)	3 (126)

TABLE 10. Teacher Best Practices Important to Inclusion: The States

TEACHER BEST PRACTICES FOR INCLUSION	IMPORTANCE Overall	General Educ.	Both	PRESENCE Overall
A. **Excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs.**	2 (32)	1a (10)	2 (22)	1 (21)
B. If the student does not perform well, there is a philosophy that the teacher has not found the best learning channel, rather than assuming the student isn't motivated.	6 (19)	3a (6)	5 (13)	4 (13)
C. Learning outcomes are clearly defined for studnets at all levels with or without disabilities.	5 (23)	2a (9)	4 (14)	2 (20)
D. Opportunities for student self-determination is a priority where both students with and without disabilities are given practice in the roles they must play in society; this includes values clarification.	7 (15)	4 (4)	6 (11)	6 (8)
E. **Peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom are encouraged.**	3 (27)	2b (9)	3a (18)	5 (11)
F. There is an emphasis not on being normal, but rather on individual student enrichment and fulfillment, e.g., self-actualization.	4 (24)	3b (6)	3b (18)	7 (7)
G. **Both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class.**	1 (33)	1b (10)	1 (23)	3 (17)

TABLE 11. Teacher Best Practices Important to Inclusion: West Virginia

The most frequently Present teacher best practices for both West Virginia and other states included:

1. ***A: Excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs,***
2. ***C: Learning outcomes are clearly defined for students at all levels with or without disabilities,***
3. ***G: Both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class.***

For the most part these frequently appearing best practices correspond to those that are the most important (indicated in bold). However, for both West Virginia and other states, teaching practice E, focusing on peer support networks, is under-represented in the school system for its importance. Similarly, for best practice F, where there is an emphasis not on being normal, but rather on self-actualization, the presence of this best practice is indicated to be lower than its importance. For West Virginia, the presence of best practice G is lower than it should be for its ranking of importance.

The effect of other factors on the importance of teacher best practices.

Type of certification: Ranks are essentially the same no matter what type of certification is considered. .

Teacher level of focus: There are some differences in the ranking of best practices. These differences are apparent for West Virginia, but not the other states. Analysis of responses from West Virginia indicate that peer support networks are seen as much more important at the primary level than at the secondary level. The same can be said for the importance of philosophy that it is the teacher's responsibility to find the best learning channel for student having trouble learning. That is, this philosophy is seen as a more important for inclusion by teachers at the primary level than those at the secondary. In contrast, having learning outcomes clearly defined is thought to be more important by teachers at the secondary level, than at the primary level, as well as individualization to student needs. ***See Table 12 for an illustration of these differences.***

For teaching practices, would ratings of importance differ if only considering the inclusion of students with developmental disabilities?
No: 246, Yes: 2.

Best Practices
Administrator Survey Question 6:
Best Teaching Practices

Administrators were asked to respond to rating the *Importance* and *Presence* of the same best practices rated by teachers. The format for rating *importance* and *presence* was exactly the

TEACHER BEST PRACTICES FOR INCLUSION	IMPORTANCE		PRESENCE	
	Primary Level	Secondary Level	Primary Level	Secondary Level
A. Excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs.	3a (16)	1 (14)	1 (11)	1 (9)
B. If the student does not perform well, there is a philosophy that the teacher has not found the best learning channel, rather than assuming the student isn't motivated.	4 (13)	6a (5)	5 (5)	2a (8)
C. Learning outcomes are clearly defined for studnets at all levels with or without disabilities.	5 (11)	3 (11)	2 (10)	2b (8)
D. Opportunities for student self-determination is a priority where both students with and without disabilities are given practice in the roles they must play in society; this includes values clarification.	6 (8)	6b (5)	6a (4)	4 (4)
E. Peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom are encouraged.	2 (17)	4 (9)	4 (8)	5 (3)
F. There is an emphasis not on being normal, but rather on individual student enrichment and fulfillment, e.g., self-actualization.	3b (16)	5 (7)	6b (4)	6 (2)
G. Both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class.	1 (19)	2 (13)	3 (9)	3 (7)

TABLE 12. Teacher Best Practices and the Effect of Educational Level: WV Teachers

same as for teachers. ***The results can be seen in Tables 13 and 14 for the States and West Virginia respectively. Again the most Important best practices are in bold.***

Importance and _Presence_ of teacher best practices as rated by administrators. ***Administrators from West Virginia displayed identical choices to West Virginia teachers for the most important best practices. In contrast, administrators from the other states, indicated the same choices as teachers for only two out of three of the best practices.*** They chose learning outcomes being clearly defined (best practice C) as one of their top three best practice most important for inclusion. Peer support networks, chosen by teachers from other states as one of the most important, was ranked number 5 in importance.

Unlike teacher responses, West Virginia administrators, as well as the other States administrators, perceived the top three Present best practices as being identical to the top three Important practices. However, for one teacher practice not in the top three, but important to inclusion, teachers and administrators across the nation do agree. For *best practice F*, focusing on self-actualization, the *Presence* of this practice within school systems, does not match its *Importance* ranking. Therefore, for this best practice, the ***opportunity to focus on self-actualization for students with disabilities in an inclusive classroom is more limited than it should be according to its importance to inclusion.***

The effect of level of administrative focus. ***For primary or secondary level West Virginia administrators and those from other states, practice F, self actualization, is judged to be among the more important teaching practices. However, administrators focused across all grade levels, e.g. higher levels of administration, see this best practices as the least important. This is unfortunate for inclusion programs since self-actualization is an important part of the learning process, especially for students with disabilities who frequently have poor self-images with which to contend. Consequently, upper level administrators may not reward teachers and administrators who are focused on this teaching practice.***

For teaching best practices, would administrator ratings of importance differ if only considering the inclusion of students with developmental disabilities? No: 241, Yes: 3.

Best Practices
Teacher Survey Question 6:
Administrative Best Practices

This question focused on administrative best practices that were obtained from the same sources indicated for teacher best practices, e.g., experts in the field, previous research findings from the funding practices study and the NASBE report. Teachers were asked to rate the importance of these administrative best practices for inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular classroom. But *they were not asked to indicate whether these practices were present within their school system* since responses on the pilot instrument indicated that most

TEACHER BEST PRACTICES FOR INCLUSION	IMPORTANCE Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	PRESENCE Overall
A. **Excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs.**	1a (202)	2 (93)	2a (34)	1 (75)	1 (140)
B. If the student does not perform well, there is a philosophy that the teacher has not found the best learning channel, rather than assuming the student isn't motivated.	5 (168)	6 (65)	2b (34)	4 (69)	4 (111)
C. **Learning outcomes are clearly defined for studnets at all levels with or without disabilities.**	2 (184)	3 (79)	1 (35)	3 (70)	2 (119)
D. Opportunities for student self-determination is a priority where both students with and without disabilities are given practice in the roles they must play in society; this includes values clarification.	6 (122)	7 (50)	5 (20)	7 (52)	7 (57)
E. Peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom are encouraged.	4 (171)	5 (72)	3 (33)	5 (66)	5 (108)
F. There is an emphasis not on being normal, but rather on individual student enrichment and fulfillment, e.g., self-actualization.	3 (174)	4 (78)	4 (31)	6 (65)	6 (94)
G. **Both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class.**	1b (202)	1 (94)	2c (34)	2 (74)	3 (114)

TABLE 13. Teacher Best Practices Important to Inclusion as Judged by Adminstrators: The States

TEACHER BEST PRACTICES FOR INCLUSION	IMPORTANCE Overall	General Educ.	Both	PRESENCE Overall
A. **Excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs.**	2 (28)	2 (15)	1 (13)	1a (20)
B. If the student does not perform well, there is a philosophy that the teacher has not found the best learning channel, rather than assuming the student isn't motivated.	5 (18)	4a (9)	4 (9)	4 (12)
C. Learning outcomes are clearly defined for studnets at all levels with or without disabilities.	4a (19)	4b (9)	3 (10)	1b (20)
D. Opportunities for student self-determination is a priority where both students with and without disabilities are given practice in the roles they must play in society; this includes values clarification.	6 (16)	5 (8)	5a (8)	5 (8)
E. **Peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom are encouraged.**	3 (22)	3a (11)	2a (11)	3 (14)
F. There is an emphasis not on being normal, but rather on individual student enrichment and fulfillment, e.g., self-actualization.	4b (19)	3b (11)	5b (8)	6 (7)
G. **Both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class.**	1 (29)	1 (16)	2b (11)	2 (15)

TABLE 14. Teacher Best Practices Important to Inclusion as Judged by WV Administrators

teachers felt unable to answer this question.

To rate the importance of the administrative best practices, teachers were provided with the same three point Likert scale indicated previously for earlier survey questions. The frequency of the high importance ratings (#3 on the scale) for each of the practices listed on the survey was tabulated and analyzed. ***The results can be seen in Table 15 with the most important administrative best practices highlighted.***

Importance of administrative best practices as rated by teachers. Although there are differences in ranking for the top choices indicated in bold between West Virginia and the other states, the choices of administrative practices were identical in regard to being perceived the most important for inclusion. These choices included:

1. ***A vision for inclusion,***
2. ***An emphasis on collaborative teams being encouraged,***
3. ***Provision of adequate training and reward structures for teachers attempting collaborative teaming,***
4. ***An overall plan for inclusion, and***
5. ***Leaders being given adequate training in the skills necessary for managing an inclusion program.***

It is interesting that best practice B, which focuses on management without coercion in the classroom and the school system is ranked low by most teacher respondents. As indicated in the introduction to this report, inclusion is a drastic change in philosophy for how teachers teach, and administrators manage. One of the essentials to the new philosophy, which emphasizes collaboration, community and self-actualization, is a management style by both teacher and administrator that is collaborative. This realization appears to not be present for the most part since a non-coercive management style must be a cornerstone in achieving this new philosophy.

In a similar manner, best practice F is ranked among the least important. This practice focuses on developing partnership with the community, e.g., parents and important community leaders. Experience from the model states selected for funding practices and for this survey, personnel practices, indicates that nurturing partnerships at the local community level is integral to supporting the inclusion effort within a school. Without it, barriers of resistance arise very quickly through divisiveness of opinion in parents, the media, and local community leaders. In other words, without a collaborative mutual effort at the local community/building level, stakeholders develop separate agendas and, because many are conflicting agendas, major barriers to inclusion arise. The consequence can be a total failure of the inclusion attempt.

Differences in most important best practices resulting from type of certification In regard to the collaboration between higher education and the school system for facilitating inclusion, *best practices K and L* appear to be more important to

ADMINISTRATIVE BEST PRACTICES	IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUSION STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. **A vision of education has been developed that is focused on quality educational outcomes for ALL students.**	1 (198)	2 (80)	1 (42)	1 (76)	2a (28)	3a (8)	2 (20)
B. There is an emphasis on management without coercion both in the classroom and in the school system as a whole.	10 (124)	7 (56)	8 (25)	7 (43)	6 (22)	4a (7)	6a (15)
C. **Collaborative teams are encouraged consisting of special and general ed. personnel who provide for screening of learning problems and team teaching.**	2 (189)	1 (81)	4 (37)	2a (71)	4a (25)	4b (7)	4a (18)
D. **Collaborative teams are provided with training and rewards needed to function.**	5 (156)	5 (64)	5 (34)	4a (58)	2b (28)	1 (10)	4a (18)
E. **A plan for inclusion has been created.**	3 (183)	3 (73)	2 (39)	2b (71)	3 (27)	3b (8)	3a (19)
F. Partnerships have been built between schools in the state and their communities.	11a (97)	11a (44)	9 (18)	10 (35)	9 (18)	5a (6)	8 (12)
G. **Leaders are given training in the skills necessary for effectively implementing an inclusive school policy.**	4 (168)	4 (67)	3 (38)	3 (63)	1 (32)	2a (9)	1 (23)
H. In-service training is coordinated with teacher certification policies.	9 (126)	8 (55)	7 (29)	8 (42)	5 (23)	2b (9)	7 (14)
I Individual teacher development plans are routinely done at the school level.	11b (97)	11b (44)	10 (16)	9 (37)	10 (16)	5b (6)	9 (10)
J. Schools are encouraged to examine beliefs about students with disabilities.	6 (145)	6 (59)	6a (33)	5 (53)	7 (20)	6 (5)	6b (15)
K. There is collaboration between general and special education departments in higher ed. to provide for dual teacher skills.	7 (142)	10 (51)	6b (33)	4b (58)	4b (25)	5c (6)	3b (19)
L. There has been coordinated policies created in higher education and the state school system to support inclusion through development of teacher and adminstrator training and certification programs.	8 (132)	9 (52)	6c (33)	6 (47)	8 (19)	7 (2)	5 (17)

TABLE 15. Administrative Best Practices - Teacher Response

teachers in special education than those in general education. That is, the importance of having special education and general education departments at the university level cooperate to provide for dual certification programs for teachers is indicated to be at least a medium level concern by those in special education, but one of the least important concerns for teachers in general education. Similarly, to have coordinated policies take place between higher education and the school system in regard to providing adequate training of teachers and administrators for inclusion is indicated to be of medium level importance by administrators in special education, and one of the least importance to those in general education.

Differences of choice by West Virginia teachers for most important best practices resulting from type of certification. For teachers from West Virginia compared to teachers responses from other states, there is more of a realization of how important *non-coercive management practices* are to inclusion. Although ranks are only medium level in importance, they are significantly higher than those from the remaining states. There is also a greater emphasis on the importance of providing *training and adequate reward structure for teachers attempting to implement collaborative teams*. ***This may be indicating a perception on the part of West Virginia teachers that these practices are not present to the degree they should be. Input from the previous funding practices survey would seem to indicate that this is true.***

Best Practices
Administrator Survey Question 8: Administrative Best Practices

This question focused on the same administrative best practices rated by teachers in their survey. However, in this case, administrators were asked to respond. Administrators were asked to rate the *importance and the presence* of these administrative best practices for inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular classroom. To rate the importance of the administrative best practices, administrators were provided with the same three point Likert scale as teachers. The frequency of the high importance ratings (#3 on the scale) for each of the practices listed on the survey was tabulated and analyzed. ***The results can be seen in Table 16 (importance data) and 17 (presence data) with the most important and frequently present administrative best practices highlighted.***

Importance of administrative best practices as rated by administrators. In regard to Table 16, for both West Virginia administrators and those from other states, ***the choice of important best practices in administration for inclusion programs was identical to teacher responses with one exception. Administrators did not think training in leadership skills for inclusion was of the highest importance.*** In fact, it was consistently the least important choice by administrators from the States group, while generally a medium level choice by those from West Virginia. More important was the practice of having schools examine their beliefs about students with disabilities in order to address biases that could act

ADMINISTRATIVE BEST PRACTICES	IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUSION STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. **A vision of education has been developed that is focused on quality educational outcomes for ALL students.**	1 (203)	1 (93)	1 (37)	1a (73)	1a (28)	1a (14)	1a (14)
B. There is an emphasis on management without coercion both in the classroom and in the school system as a whole.	9 (147)	8 (68)	7 (23)	7 (56)	4a (21)	2a (12)	2a (11)
C. **Collaborative teams are encouraged consisting of special and general ed. personnel who provide for screening of learning problems and team teaching.**	2 195)	2 (90)	3a (32)	1b (73)	1b (28)	1b (14)	1b (14)
D. **Collaborative teams are provided with training and rewards needed to function.**	5 (179)	5 (75)	3b (32)	2 (72)	3a (22)	2b (12)	3a (10)
E. **A plan for inclusion has been created.**	3 (190)	3 (83)	2 (34)	1c (73)	2 (25)	1c (14)	2b (11)
F. Partnerships have been built between schools in the state and their communities.	11 (122)	11 (51)	8 (21)	9 (50)	5a (19)	5a (8)	2c (11)
G. Leaders are given training in the skills necessary for effectively implementing an inclusive school policy.	12 (107)	12 (48)	10 (19)	10 (40)	5b (19)	4a (9)	3b (10)
H. In-service training is coordinated with teacher certification policies.	10 (123)	10 (52)	9 (20)	8 (51)	6a (16)	5b (8)	4 (8)
I Individual teacher development plans are routinely done at the school level.	7 (164)	6 (71)	5 (28)	6 (65)	4a (21)	3a (10)	2d (11)
J. **Schools are encouraged to examine beliefs about students with disabilities.**	4 (181)	4 (82)	4a (29)	3 (70)	3b (22)	2c (12)	3c (10)
K. There is collaboration between general and special education departments in higher ed. to provide for dual teacher skills.	6 (165)	7 (69)	4b (29)	4 (67)	4c (21)	3b (10)	2c (11)
L. There has been coordinated policies created in higher education and the state school system to support inclusion through development of teacher and adminstrator training and certification programs.	8 (155)	9 (63)	6 (26)	5 (66)	6b (16)	4b (9)	5 (7)

TABLE 16. Important Administrative Best Practices - Administrators Response

ADMINISTRATIVE BEST PRACTICES	PRESENCE IN SCHOOL SYSTEM STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. **A vision of education has been developed that is focused on quality educational outcomes for ALL students.**	2 (145)	1 (73)	1 (22)	2 (50)	1 (22)	1 (13)	1 (9)
B. There is an emphasis on management without coercion both in the classroom and in the school system as a whole.	6 (94)	5 (46)	6a (13)	4 (35)	5 (12)	3a (9)	6a (3)
C. **Collaborative teams are encouraged consisting of special and general ed. personnel who provide for screening of learning problems and team teaching.**	1 (146)	2 (72)	2 (22)	1 (52)	2 (19)	2a (12)	2 (7)
D. Collaborative teams are provided with training and rewards needed to function.	8 (79)	9 (39)	8 (11)	6a (29)	8 (8)	5a (5)	6b (3)
E. **A plan for inclusion has been created.**	3 (99)	3 (53)	9 (10)	3a (36)	4 (13)	3b (9)	5a (4)
F. **Partnerships have been built between schools in the state and their communities.**	5 (96)	7 (43)	4 (17)	3b (36)	3 (18)	2b (12)	3 (6)
G. Leaders are given training in the skills necessary for effectively implementing an inclusive school policy.	10 (72)	10 (36)	7 (12)	7 (24)	7a (9)	6a (4)	4 (5)
H. In-service training is coordinated with teacher certification policies.	4 (98)	4 (51)	5 (14)	5 (33)	6a (10)	4 (8)	8 (2)
I. Individual teacher development plans are routinely done at the school level.	7 (92)	6 (45)	3 (18)	6b (29)	7b (9)	5b (5)	5b (4)
J. Schools are encouraged to examine beliefs about students with disabilities.	9 (77)	8 (42)	6b (13)	8 (22)	6b (10)	3c (9)	9 (1)
K. There is collaboration between general and special education departments in higher ed. to provide for dual teacher skills.	12 (41)	12 (19)	10a (9)	10 (13)	10 (2)	7 (2)	10 (0)
L. There has been coordinated policies created in higher education and the state school system to support inclusion through development of teacher and adminstrator training and certification programs.	11 (47)	11 (23)	10b (9)	9 (15)	9 (7)	6b (4)	7 (3)

TABLE 17. Presence of Administrative Best Practices - Administrators Response

as barriers. Thus, the most important administrative practices for managing inclusion programs included:

1. ***A: A vision for inclusion,***
2. ***C: An emphasis on collaborative teams being encouraged,***
3. ***D: Provision of adequate training and reward structures for teachers attempting collaborative teaming,***
4. ***E: An overall plan for inclusion, and***
5. ***J: Schools examining beliefs about students with disabilities.***

Differences of choice specific to West Virginia administrators for most important best practices. In regard to West Virginia administrators, ***best practice B,*** was rated very differently than their counterparts in other states. Administrators from West Virginia ranked this practice fourth (overall). In contrast, this practice was again indicated to be one of the least important by administrators in the remaining states. Further, this practice was perceived to be of only medium level importance by West Virginia teachers in the teacher survey. Remember, this practice focuses on a crucial cornerstone to inclusion programs - management without coercion in the classroom and school system. ***Thus, it appears that West Virginia administrators are more aware of the importance of this management style to successful inclusion programs.***

In an identical manner to the teacher survey, ***best practice F*** was again ranked among the least important by administrators from other states than West Virginia, e.g, developing partnership with the community. However, unlike West Virginia teachers and administrators from general education, ***West Virginia special education administrators, see this practice as highly important to the success of an inclusion programs with a rank of 2 indicated.***

Presence of administrative best practices. In regard to administrative best practices most frequently seen in the public school system (*Presence).* Table 17 indicates the following to be chosen either by West Virginia administrators or those from other states. The first two practices listed are common choices of both West Virginia administrators and those from other states. The last two are unique to each but among the more frequent best practices experienced by each:

1. ***A: A vision of education for inclusion,***
2. ***C: Encouragement of collaborative teams***
3. ***E: A plan for inclusion, and***
4. ***F: Partnerships built between schools and their communities.***

Comparing *Presence* and *Importance* of administrative best practices.

Practice G - leadership training: The presence of providing for ***leadership training in inclusion***, generally matches the lack of emphasis on this aspect for all the states including West Virginia. This is unfortunate since information from model states provided by the

funding practices project indicates that effective local leadership is crucial to the success of inclusion programs.

Practices J and D: There is a major discrepancy between the administrative best practices most frequently present and those that are judged the most important by West Virginia as well as the remaining states. Both practices J and D are missing from the list of most frequently present administrative best practices. D focuses on providing enough training and support for teachers attempting to implement collaborative teams; J focuses on the practice of causing school personnel to examine their beliefs about students with disabilities. ***Therefore, these important administrative practices are operating far less frequently than they should be to provide for successful inclusion programs in West Virginia school systems, as well as other states across the nation.***

Practice F: Partnerships between schools and their local communities are more frequent in West Virginia and the other states than the emphasis on importance of this best practice. The importance of establishing such partnerships was not judged to be very high. However, the presence of this practice is fairly frequent. Perhaps these partnerships are established out of necessity because of parent demands and fear of community reaction. To make full use of such partnerships, however, they should be viewed as positive force for promoting successful inclusion practices that could prove to be quite powerful if nurtured.

Best practice K and L - coordination between high ed and public school administration: Although this practice was not ranked as important by administrators in general education across the nation, and received only a medium level rank of importance by special education administrators, the presence of these practices are far less than any ranking of importance for all states under consideration. It seems there is little coordination present between the public schools and higher education across the nation regarding teacher and administrator training for inclusion.

Differences in frequency of best choice as a result of type of certification.

Best Practice B - management without coercion: In West Virginia, there was an emphasis on the importance of management without coercion. The presence of this management practice is far more frequent for general education administrators than for special education administrators in West Virginia. A rank of 3 indicates fairly frequent appearance of this practice according to general educators. In contrast, administrators in special education indicate a rank of 6 for this same practice.

Best practice H - inservice training coordinated with teacher certification policies: The presence of this best practice is more frequent for general education administrators than for special education administrators in West Virginia.

Best practice J - examination of beliefs about students with disabilities: This practice is more frequent for general education administrators than special education administrators across the nation.

Best practice G - leadership training: The practice of providing for leadership training seems to be more frequently experienced by administrators in special education than general education for all states including West Virginia.

Differences in choice relating to administrator level of focus. Choices of ***important*** best practices were essentially identical across all levels of administrator focus (primary, secondary, both) for most administrative practices. However, some differences were present:

1. ***For all states including West Virginia, those administrators ranking management without coercion (practice B) least important were those responsible for all grades.*** Those administrators with responsibilities focused at the primary or secondary level were more likely to rank this best practice at a higher level of importance in regard to inclusion. Not surprisingly, the presence of this management technique is more frequent for primary and secondary level administrators, than those responsible for all grades in the school system.

2. ***For solely West Virginia administrators, the perceived importance of providing training to leaders for inclusion was ranked lowest by those with responsibilities at the secondary level.*** In regard to the actual presence of this best practice, administrators with responsibilities across all grades indicated that such training was more likely to be present for them than for administrators at the primary or secondary levels. In contrast, administrators in other states at the secondary level were most likely to receive leadership training in inclusion.

3. ***Administrators from West Virginia and the other states indicated that partnerships between local schools and their communities were much more likely to be present at the secondary level than at the primary level.*** Further, for West Virginia administrators, partnerships were even more likely to be encouraged by administrators responsible for all grade levels than primary or secondary levels.

4. ***Administrators from West Virginia and other states indicated that individual teacher development plans were least likely to occur at the secondary level.*** Primary level administrators indicated the most frequent practice of this approach.

Inservice Practices
Teacher Survey Question 7

This question focused on inservice practices and their impact on inclusion of students with disabilities. A list of inservice topics was provided with additional space under *other* to write in topics thought to be important by teacher respondents. Teachers were asked to indicate the presence of the listed inservice topics in their school system, and their importance to inclusion. To rate importance the Likert scale below was provided.

1 = no to little importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
2 = medium importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities
3 = high importance for facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities

Scores of high importance (#3) were tabulated and analyzed. The results can be seen in Table 18 displaying the importance of inservice practices and 19 displaying the presence of the same practices. Ranks are indicated under each column for a particular group with the number of individuals picking that response indicated in parenthesis below the ranks given. ***The most important and most frequent inservice practices are indicated in bold for Tables 18 and 19 respectively.***

Importance and Presence of inservice topic areas as rated by teachers. In regard to Table 18, although there are again differences in ranking of importance for specific inservice practices, the group of practices that are at the top are exactly the same for West Virginia versus other states in the country. These included:

1. ***C: Implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners,***
2. ***D: Classroom management skills including behavior control,***
3. ***G: Promoting student self-concept/self-actualization, and***
4. ***I: Fostering student collaboration (peer tutoring) to promote learning.***

The ranking of importance for ***all*** listed inservice practices rated by teachers from West Virginia are remarkably similar to other teachers rankings in the other states. Thus, there is essentially no difference between responses from teachers in West Virginia and the rest of the nation in regard to importance of inservice practices for achieving successful inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom.

In regard to Table 19 (presence data), again the same inservice topics were picked as being the most frequently present in their school system by both teachers from West Virginia and those from the remaining states. The most frequently present inservice topics were identical to those that were the most important for inclusion. Therefore, there ranked importance of each of the inservice areas matches the availability of the topic for teachers in inservice trainings.

For promoting student self-concept (G), it appears that teachers from general education across the board feel this is more important in regard to an inservice topic than teachers from special education or those with dual certification. It may be than the latter group of teachers have had this included in their preservice training and background more so than general education teachers. In any case, it appears that this is much more of an important topic for teachers from general education than special education. In comparing the frequency of this to its importance ranking, the inservice topic seems under-represented in frequency of appearance when compared to its importance. Its frequency is ranked only at a medium level relative to the other topics, but its importance is ranked among the top three important topics for inclusion.

Differences in ranking of *Presence* due to type of certification.

Developing interpersonal communication skills for collaborative teams (F): For teachers within special education for the states other than West Virginia, this inservice topic was

TEACHER INSERVICE PRACTICES	IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUSION						
	STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. Creating and utilizing linkages with state and community services.	8 (89)	8 (42)	7 (12)	6a (35)	8 (12)	6 (4)	7 (8)
B. Medical aspects of different disabilities including etiology, student characteristics, and use of prothestic devices.	7 (100)	7 (46)	6 (18)	5a (36)	7 (16)	4a (6)	6 (10)
C. **Implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners.**	2 (173)	3 (71)	1a (37)	1a (65)	1 (32)	1 (9)	1 (23)
D. **Classroom management skills including individual and group behavior control procedures.**	1 (178)	1a (76)	1b (37)	1b (65)	2 (30)	2 (8)	2 (22)
E. Use of assessment data to plan instruction.	5 (137)	6 (55)	4 (30)	4 (52)	4a (24)	4b (6)	3a (18)
F. Developing interpersonal communication skills for working collaboratively on a multidisciplinary team.	4a (168)	4 (70)	2a (36)	2a (62)	5 (22)	5a (5)	4a (17)
G. **Promoting student self-concept/ self-actualization.**	3 (171)	1b (76)	3 (33)	2b (62)	4b (24)	3a (7)	4b (17)
H. Managing multicultural diversity in the classroom.	6 (117)	5 (61)	5 (21)	6b (35)	6 (18)	5b (5)	5 (13)
I. **Fostering student collaboration (e.g. peer tutoring) to promote learning.**	4b (168)	2 (72)	2b (36)	3 (60)	3 (25)	3b (7)	3b (18)
J. OTHER: predominant response written in - training in inclusion techniques especially collaborative teaming approaches	9 (14)	9 (1)	8 (5)	7 (8)	9 (1)	7 (0)	8 (1)

TABLE 18. Importance of Teacher Inservice Practices

TEACHER INSERVICE PRACTICES	PRESENCE OF PRACTICES						
	STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. Creating and utilizing linkages with state and community services.	8 (57)	8 (23)	7 (5)	8 (29)	5 (13)	3a (3)	4a (10)
B. Medical aspects of different disabilities including etiology, student characteristics, and use of prothestic devices.	7 (63)	9 (17)	5 (20)	9 (26)	7 (3)	5 (0)	5 (3)
C. **Implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners.**	1 (155)	1 (67)	1 (30)	2 (58)	1 (25)	2a (4)	1 (21)
D. **Classroom management skills including individual and group behavioral control procedures.**	2 (151)	2 (63)	2 (29)	1 (59)	2 (17)	2b (4)	2a (13)
E. Use of assessment data to plan instruction.	4 (117)	6 (49)	4a (21)	4 (47)	4 (14)	2c (4)	4b (10)
F. Developing interpersonal communication communication skills for working collaboratively on a multidisciplinary team.	5a (115)	7 (44)	4b (21)	3 (50)	6a (12)	4a (2)	4c (10)
G. **Promoting student self-concept/ self-actualization.**	5b (115)	4 (53)	4c (21)	6 (47)	3a (16)	3b (3)	2b (13)
H. Managing multicultural diversity in the classroom.	6 (101)	5 (52)	6 (19)	7 (30)	6b (12)	4b (2)	4d (10)
I. **Fostering student collaboration (e.g. peer tutoring) to promote learning.**	3 (127)	3 (58)	3 (24)	5 (45)	3b (16)	1 (5)	3 (11)
J. OTHER: predominant response written in - training in inclusion techniques especially collaborative teaming.	9 (9)	10 (0)	8 (3)	10 (6)	8 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)

TABLE 19. Presence of Teacher Inservice Practices

ranked among the top three topics as important to inclusion skills for teachers. In comparing this ranking to its presence within school systems as a frequently appearing inservice, it seems to not appear as frequently as this importance rating would demand.

Fostering student collaboration to promote peer tutoring (I): For special education teachers, this inservice topic seems to appear less frequently than for general education teachers regardless of which state is being considered.

Inservice Practices
Administrator Survey Question 9

Administrators were given a list of inservice topics and asked to indicate their frequency of appearance in their school system, as well as their importance for inclusion. To some degree, the list of topics overlapped with the list provided to teachers. But additional topic areas were provided unique to administrative concerns. To rate importance of the inservice topics, administrators were provided with the same three point scale described for other survey questions. Ratings of high importance were tabulated and analyzed. ***The results can be seen in Table 20 in regard to importance of inservice topics for inclusion, and Table 21 for presence of the same topic areas. As before, ranks are indicated under each group discussed, with the number of administrators responding shown in parenthesis below the rank. Tied ranks are indicated by the small letter to the right of the number. Those inservice topics most important or most frequently present in a school system are displayed in bold for each table.***

***Importance* of inservice topics as rated by school administrators.** The importance of specific inservice topics displays some divergence in scores when comparing West Virginia responses to the rest of the states. Four of the inservice topics in bold in Table 20 are common to both West Virginia administrators' responses and the remaining states:

1. ***E: Developing interpersonal communication skills for working collaboratively on a multidisciplinary team,***
2. ***G: Establishing a multi-disciplinary collaborative team,***
3. ***H: Fostering teacher collaboration, and***
4. ***J: Supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion.***

Three more inservice topics ranked among the top three are unique to West Virginia administrators:

1. ***C: Implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners,***
2. ***D: Use of assessment data to play instruction, and***
3. ***I: Re-designing a curriculum for inclusion.***

West Virginia, therefore, displayed seven topic areas that were among its most important administrator inservices for inclusion. This resulted from multiple tied ranks for the second and third choices of topics.

ADMINISTRATOR INSERVICE PRACTICES	IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUSION STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. Creating and utilizing linkages with state and community services.	11 (103)	12 (38)	8 (23)	12 (42)	7a (11)	6 (5)	5a (6)
B. Medical aspects of different disabilities including etiology, student characteristics, and use of prothestic devices.	12 (95)	11 (49)	9 (15)	13 (31)	7b (11)	4a (8)	6 (3)
C. **Implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners**	7 (154)	8a (68)	3a (32)	10 (54)	2a (25)	1a (14)	3a (11)
D. **Use of assessment data to plan instruction.**	5 (165)	3 (80)	5a (29)	8 (56)	3a (24)	2a (13)	3b (11)
E. **Developing interpersonal communication skills for working collaboratively on a multidisciplinary teams.**	3 (174)	4 (73)	2 (33)	4 (68)	4a (21)	3a (12)	4a (9)
F. Managing multicultural diversity in the classroom.	10 (136)	10 (58)	7a (26)	11 (52)	6 (13)	5 (7)	5b (6)
G. **Establishing multi-disciplinary, collaborative teams.**	4 (173)	5 (72)	3b (32)	3 (69)	3b (24)	3b (12)	2a (12)
H. **Fostering teacher collaboration**	2 (196)	2 (85)	1a (38)	2 (73)	3c (24)	3c (12)	2b (12)
I. **Re-designing a curriculum for inclusion.**	6a (164)	7 (69)	4 (30)	5 (65)	2b (25)	2b (13)	2c (12)
J. **Supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion.**	1 (204)	1 (90)	1b (38)	1 (76)	1 (27)	1b (14)	1 (13)
K. Managing organization change.	9 (144)	9 (63)	7b (26)	9 (55)	5a (17)	4b (8)	4b (9)
L. Informing and eliciting parent and community support for inclusion.	6b (164)	5 (71)	5b (29)	6 (64)	4b (21)	3d (12)	4c (9)
M. Planning for organizational change.	8 (153)	8b (68)	6 (27)	7 (58)	5b (17)	4c (8)	4d (9)
N. Other: Predominant response - inclusion approaches for classroom such as outcome based education, cooperative learning, co-teaching.	13 (10)	13 (3)	10 (2)	14 (5)	8 (1)	7 (1)	7 (0)

TABLE 20. Importance of Administrator Inservice Practices

ADMINISTRATOR INSERVICE PRACTICES	PRESENCE OF PRACTICES						
	STATES				WEST VIRGINIA		
	Overall	General Educ.	Special Educ.	Both	Overall	General Educ.	Both
A. Creating and utilizing linkages with state and community services.	7 (108)	10 (43)	7 (18)	5a (47)	5a (12)	5a (6)	3a (6)
B. Medical aspects of different disabilities including etiology, student characteristics, and use of prothestic devices.	12 (85)	11 (32)	10a (14)	7 (39)	9 (7)	7 (1)	3b (6)
C. **Implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners.**	1 (168)	1a (74)	1 (30)	1 (64)	1 (22)	1a (12)	1a (10)
D. **Use of assessment data to plan instruction.**	2 (156)	1b (74)	2 (27)	2 (55)	2 (21)	1b (12)	2a (9)
E. **Developing interpersonal communication skills for working collaboratively on a multidisciplinary teams.**	5 (126)	4 (59)	3 (24)	6 (43)	3 (18)	2 (9)	2b (9)
F. Managing multicultural diversity in the classroom.	6 (111)	6 (49)	10b (14)	4 (48)	6a (11)	5b (6)	4a (5)
G. **Establishing multi-disciplinary, collaborative teams.**	4 (131)	2 (69)	6 (19)	3 (52)	4 (16)	5c (6)	1b (10)
H. **Fostering teacher collaboration.**	3 (135)	3 (65)	4 (23)	5b (47)	6b (11)	5d (6)	4b (5)
I. Re-designing a curriculum for inclusion.	13 (84)	7a (48)	11 (11)	11 (25)	6c (11)	4 (7)	5a (4)
J. Supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion.	8 (107)	5 (50)	5a (20)	8a (37)	7 (10)	5e (6)	5b (4)
K. Managing organization change.	10 (100)	7b (48)	9 (16)	9 (36)	5b (12)	3 (8)	5c (4)
L. Informing and eliciting parent and community support for inclusion.	11 (96)	9 (45)	8 (17)	10 (34)	8a (8)	5f (6)	7 (2)
M. Planning for organizational change.	9 (104)	8 (47)	5b (20)	8b (37)	8b (8)	6 (5)	6 (3)
N. Other: Predominant response - inclusion approaches for classroom such as outcome based education, cooperative learning, co-teaching.	14 (4)	12 (1)	12 (1)	12 (2)	10 (0)	8 (0)	8 (0)

TABLE 21. Presence of Administrator Inservice Practices

Inservice areas important to inclusion but not identified as such. It is interesting that ***managing multicultural diversity in the classroom*** was not seen as an important inservice training area for successful inclusion programs by administrators from all states including West Virginia. As indicated in an earlier discussion of preservice training areas, those students coming from different cultural backgrounds bring with them different learning patterns and expectations of appropriate and satisfying behavior (Lynch and Hanson, 1992). The American culture, unfortunately, has historically ignored these needs because of a melting pot concept of diversity, e.g., all ethnic backgrounds must melt into the accepted standards of the culture. Therefore, the need to be sensitive to, and plan for, learning approaches that take cultural differences and their unique learning needs into consideration has been masked by this philosophy.

Another area that was ranked among the last in importance in regard to inservice training topics was ***planning for and managing organizational change.*** The philosophy of inclusion demands a reorganization of the way schools are structured and managed to be successful. It is clear from the model states' feedback for the funding practices project that hierarchical, coercive management styles, either in the classroom or at the administrative levels, **do not work!** Yet, this is the only model to which many of us have been exposed. That makes learning a more collaborative approach which would foster community and learning for ALL students very difficult to develop and especially to maintain and implement on a day to day basis. It appears, nationally, that this fact is not fully appreciated by school administrators.

Presence of preservice areas important to inclusion. From Table 21, the preservice areas that are most frequently present for school administrators across the county are displayed in bold. The choices again illustrate both a commonality and divergence of topics within the top four choices of West Virginia administrators compared to administrators from other states. The topics in bold include the following:

1. ***C: Implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners,***
2. ***D: Use of assessment data to plan instruction,***
3. ***E: Developing interpersonal communication skills for working collaboratively on a multidisciplinary team,***
4. ***G: Establishing multi-disciplinary collaborative teams, and***
5. ***H: Fostering teacher collaboration.***

Of those listed above the third choices of administrators from West Virginia compared to the rest of the states diverge. West Virginia administrators indicated that E was the third most frequent inservice area presented in their state of the choices listed. In contrast, administrators from other states indicated that H was the third most frequent topic area.

Presence of inservice areas contrasted to their importance. ***H: fostering teaching collaboration, I: re-designing a curriculum for inclusion, and J: supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion*** were ranked among the most important inservice areas for inclusion. However, the ranking for presence of this inservice topics across the nation and

in West Virginia reveal that the opportunity to attend training topics in these areas are under-represented for their importance to inclusion.

Another inservice area where this is true is for ***L: informing and eliciting parent and community support for inclusion.*** Although this was ranked as only of medium level importance for a inservice training topic for inclusion, the frequency with which this is offered in school systems, whether West Virginia or other states, is less than it should be for the indicated importance of the area by administrators.

Effect of administrator level of focus on inservice practices. Administrators in states other than West Virginia indicated no differences in their importance ratings for inservice practices based on whether they were primarily focused at the primary, secondary or all grade levels. In contrast, ***West Virginia primary level administrators gave more importance to training in medical aspects of disabilities (B), while those at the secondary level gave more importance to obtaining training in use of assessment data to plan instruction (D) and fostering teaching collaboration (H).***

In regard to presence of inservice topics, the following differences were indicated:
1. ***West Virginia administrators at the primary level, as well as those from other states, indicated that they were more like to receive training in organizational change (K) than those at the secondary level.***

2. For ***West Virginia administrators*** this was also true for two more inservice area (J): supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion, and (L): informing and eliciting parent and community support for inclusion. That is, administrators at the primary level more frequently received training in these areas than those at the secondary level. This was not true for administrators from other states.

3. ***Primary level administrators from other states*** than West Virginia indicated more frequent training in managing multicultural diversity in the classroom (F) than those at the secondary level or across all grade levels. In contrast, administrators with responsibilities across all grade levels indicated more frequent training in creating and utilizing linkages with state and community services (A).

Barriers to Inclusion
Administrator Survey Question 10
Teacher Survey Question 10

Both administrators and teachers were asked to describe the three greatest barriers to inclusion through an open ended question format. A content analysis was done to identify repeated themes indicated by respondents. ***These themes are indicated in Table 22 for both teacher and administrator responses across West Virginia and the other states. Under each category are specific examples of comments made by respondents for that category. The number***

BARRIERS TO INCLUSION	STATES		WEST VIRGINIA		Total
	Admin	Tcher	Admin	Tcher	
1. **INEFFECTIVE TRAINING PROCEDURES** such as lack of training in collaborative teams, lack of knowledge about disability for general ed. teachers, separate inservice trainings for special and general ed., lack of knowledge about how to adapt curriculums and individualize strategies.	134	102	15	18	269
2. **BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES THAT ACT AS BARRIERS** such as special students require special teachers, fear by general ed. teachers of disruption in the classroom, fear of change, parents and unions fears, all children can't learn, we-they mentality on the part of teachers and parents or administrators, protection of turf, inclusion is impossible to do without slighting other children that have more potential.	80	93	11	27	211
3. **RIGID OR INEFFECTIVE POLICIES AND SYSTEM PROCESSES** such as certification policies, standardized testing, teacher evaluation system, teachers not trained in inclusion, rigid curriculum requirements, students grouped by age and/or disability, funding formula regs, scheduling	182	61	17	5	265
4. **LACK OF TEACHER SUPPORT** such as lack of teaching materials to support inclusion, too many teaching duties assigned, class sizes too large, no teacher aides for inclusive classes, no co-planning time.	50	90	5	18	163
5. LACK OF FUNDING AND RESOURCES such as budget cuts, limited money to hire teacher aides and buy needed teaching matierals.	54	27	8	2	91
6. POOR LEADERSHIP STRATEGIES such as state universities not providing leadership in inclusion, lack of vision, no clear plan or guidelines, lack of real knowledge about demands of inclusion, authoritarian dictums, no incentives provided, inclusion not really valued, control games.	52	27	8	4	91
7. POOR COMMUNICATION such as lack of on-going communication to solve problems and celebrate successes, ineffective communication about inclusion plan and its implementation to local schools, misunderstanding about what inclusion is by parents and teachers, lack of communication between general ed. and special ed.	23	15	5	5	48
8. FACILITIES ARE NOT ACCESSIBLE such as inaccessible buildings and lack of transportation for those students that are physically disabled.	9	8	2	1	20
9. LACK OF RESEARCH ABOUT EFFECTIVE INCLUSION STRATEGIES	2	11	0	0	13
10. INEFFECTIVE HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES AND SYSTEMS such as separate special ed. and general ed. departments at the university level resulting in separate training that is ineffective for inclusion, ineffective training in general about inclusion strategies.	18	2	2	0	24

TABLE 22. Barriers to Inclusion

provided under each column indicates the frequency of mention for the theme under consideration. The most frequent themes for all respondents are indicated in bold.

Five Model States

Five model states were selected through the use of the criteria and computation of scores for each state described earlier. The resultant ranking of each of the states is displayed in the box to the right.

The five model states that were selected through the process described were District of Columbia, Vermont, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Colorado. With the exception of Pennsylvania, these states are entirely different from those chosen for representing ideal funding practices for inclusion. In fact, those model states representing good funding practices fall in the middle to the lower part of the rank order of states.

A structured telephone interview was developed to obtain indepth information from the model states in regard to the operation of the best personnel practices were identified. Information was also obtained related to these practices that addressed how to build and maintain a good program for inclusion. These results are presented in this section. Capsules of each model state are presented first, followed by specific information about personnel practices for inclusion across the model states.

RANKING OF STATES FOR PRESENCE OF BEST PERSONNEL PRACTICES FOR INCLUSION

State	Adminstr Score	Teacher Score	Overall Score
DC	25	12	37
NH	12	22	35
CO	26	6	32
OH	25	6	31
PA	23	5	28
DE	27	0	27
VT	27	0	27
OK	8	16	24
CA	17	6	23
IA	14	9	23
KS	14	9	23
KY	6	16	22
SD	10	12	22
AR	11	11	22
WY	10	12	22
RI	13	8	21
VA	11	8	19
OR	8	11	19
SC	5	14	19
NC	5	14	19
MO	8	10	18
ID	O	18	18
MT	5	11	16
LA	5	11	16
UT	8	8	16
WV	5	9	14
FL	6	8	14
MA	6	8	14
MN	5	9	14
NM	8	5	13
MI	6	6	12
NE	6	6	12
IL	3	9	12
AL	5	6	11
CT	6	5	11
IN	5	6	11
ND	5	6	11
NJ	5	6	11
ME	5	5	10
TX	5	5	10
MD	5	5	10
HI	5	5	10
GA	5	5	10
NY	3	5	8
NY	3	5	8
TN	3	5	8
MS	8	0	8
AK	5	0	5
AZ	0	5	5
WA	0	5	5
NV	3	0	3

A Capsule of the Model States

District of Columbia. The District is piloting models for inclusion within specific magnate schools. Within these schools there are peer support networks operating to bring about cooperative learning. Computers are used to provide challenges and choice opportunities to all students in the classroom. Multidisciplinary

teams make decisions about the needs of students with disabilities. A competency-based curriculum is being developed. Since the predominant population is African-American, multicultural diversity is not seen as a high priority to be addressed for the student population.

There is a plan for inclusion with an overall vision statement for the pilot schools. The principal of each school is given the responsibility for implementing the vision for inclusion specific to the school population within the building. Respondents to the telephone interview indicated that outcomes seem not to be clearly defined within this process. Rather the specific outcomes are left to the definition of the local school principal.

General issues that must be addressed include:

1. Negative attitude on the part of general education teachers in the rest of the school system,
2. How to address a concept like inclusion within the deeper issues of inner city violence and survival, as well as the lack of self-esteem faced by many students with or without disabilities, and
3. How to get local colleges and universities involved in the inclusion process.

Vermont. A statewide plan for inclusion has been developed and implemented state wide over a period of years. The original plan was developed by various focus groups throughout the system. The philosophy of inclusion that has been developed appears to act as a guideline for everyday decision-making both at the state and local level. From the actions and communication of the state leadership, those interviewed felt that inclusion and collaboration were deeply held values. Training has been provided to teachers implementing inclusion, with the University of Vermont involved in providing training through a federal grant. Interviewees felt it was easier to integrate inclusion into the system because there was no large state bureaucracy in place to act as a barrier to flexibility and problem solving.

At the building level, each principal is given the freedom to interpret the philosophy of inclusion as appropriate for their population of students. The philosophy of inclusion seems to be deeply internalized in the functioning of both teachers and administrators. Small groups and individualized strategies are used in inclusion classrooms. Collaborative teams are common consisting of general education and special education personnel. Class sizes are small and cooperative learning is used within the classes. Learning outcomes are defined by the curriculum and IEPs, but interviewees felt that there should be better definition of learning outcomes. Interviewees felt cultural issues were not a priority because of the predominantly white population operating within the schools interviewed.

Pennsylvania. A statewide plan for inclusion has been developed and implemented over a period of time. All schools are not yet involved; rather the number of schools involved has been gradually increased. The state started with a year of piloting and then developed an overall plan for inclusion through broad-based focus groups throughout the state. Parents were integrally involved in the development and implementation process. The vision and mission developed at the state level appears to be operating effectively within

many of the schools in the system. Interviewees felt that the reason the philosophy has succeeded within the system is a lack of emphasis on top-down decision making. Rather, grassroots collaboration was emphasized from the beginning. Extensive training has also been provided to both teachers and administrators.

At the building level, each school has created its own mission statement through broad-based community groups. Parent are integrally linked into the inclusion planning and implementation process. Teachers work in collaborative teams where a collegial relationship is emphasized and supported. Cooperative learning and peer networks are present within many inclusive classrooms. Special education is viewed not as a program, but rather a service. There is, however, a continuum of services available where children with disabilities can receive individualized instruction outside of the classroom. But, the priority is placement within the general education classroom. Cultural issues are not seen as a high priority issue because of the dominant white population within many of the schools.

New Hampshire. There is a system-wide plan for inclusion. This plan has been supplemented by community wide forums at local levels to define best practices for inclusion. Out of these meetings school based mission statements and objectives for inclusion have been developed tailored to specific community needs. Communication and discussion meetings are on-going and informal to provide for problem solving and discussion of inclusion. Teachers have been provided with intensive training in regard to learning strategies for inclusion. This was aided by a state change grant awarded to the University of New Hampshire. However, interviewees felt the need for additional training in inclusive strategies and the best approach to collaborative teaming.

The philosophy at the building level is that all children should have the opportunity to be educated in the regular classroom. Collaborative teaming is a priority and a main device for providing for inclusion. Time for co-planning is provided to teachers. An outcome based curriculum is being developed, but not in place as yet. Presently, outcomes are defined by the curriculum and IEP. Communication with all important stakeholders in the building is a priority so that parents are educated about inclusion, and integrally involved in the planning and implementation process. A continuum of services is provided so that some children can still receive small group instruction and one-to-one individualized instruction out of the regular classroom when needed. But the priority is education within the general education classroom.

The school system is starting to write IEPs for all children, and futures planning is done for secondary level students with disabilities. Aspects of Total Quality Management are integrated into the inclusion process. Multicultural diversity is not seen as an issue for the inclusion process in this state.

Colorado. Colorado's effort started with a system-wide philosophy developed in 1985 that stated that children are best educated with their normal peers. The philosophy formed the basis for the resulting inclusion system. The philosophy and plan for inclusion

were developed through groups of task forces that included all major stakeholders. The outcomes was a mission statement that included 10 belief statements about inclusion. Inclusion was done over a five year period on a graduated basis. TQM philosophy has been integrated into the inclusion planning and development process at the local level. Beliefs and values integral to inclusion seem to have become internalized in the system and at the local level.

At the building level, an intensive amount of training has been provided to teachers, especially those in general education. Little help has been provided by any institution of higher education in the state in providing training in inclusion. Teachers interviewed felt the need for more on-going training, but felt generally felt support by their administrators. Collaborative teams have been developed and time for co-planning is provided. An outcome based curriculum is being developed but is not in place. There is a peer support program that has been developed that encourages cooperative learning. Planning for cultural diversity is not seen as important for inclusion.

Model States' Recommendations for Implementation

Themes were identified for all questions incorporated in the structured phone interview through performing a qualitative analysis. The themes that were frequently mentioned by the five model states as being important to inclusive personnel practices will be discussed in this section.

1. Broad-based philosophy and plan for inclusion. Throughout the interview participants repeatedly discusses the necessity of having and **knowing about** an overall plan for inclusion that established core values, established broad desired outcomes for inclusion, provided for broad guidelines and specific criteria for measuring whether the outcomes had been accomplished. This plan essentially provided them with a desired broad model for inclusion from which the local school could generate more specific missions, outcomes and goals for their particular community and its needs.

A Blueprint For Inclusive Personnel Practices

- ***Philosophy and plan for inclusion***
- ***Site-based management teams***
- ***Discussion of values and beliefs***
- ***Collaborative teams***
- ***Adequate teacher support***
- ***Involvement of higher education***
- ***On-going training opportunities***
- ***Peer networks for cooperative education***
- ***Clear learning outcomes***

All of the model states had some kind of overall plan in place. None of the states had ALL of the elements indicated above. However, the elements listed were those repeatedly mentioned by those interviewed as necessary elements within an effectively operating mission,

vision and plan for inclusion. Additionally interviewees indicated the necessity of developing AND implementing this plan through a broad-based stakeholder group or groups that represented all major stakeholders for inclusion in the state. They indicated that such a mixture provided for commitment and support for the philosophy. Moreover, maintaining the group or groups over time provided for a necessary overall cohesive problem solving group for problems as they arose in the system change process that occurred.

About one quarter to the teachers interviewed across the model states did not know that their state had an overall plan for inclusion in place. This left the teacher feeling as if the state level had not done their job, and left the local school to its own purposes. This feeling acted as a barrier to inclusion for these teachers, in regard to generating negative attitudes and resentment.

2. **Site-based management teams or forums.** All model states had some type of a local planning group that operated at the building level. The membership of the group was a miniature of the composition of overall state planning groups, e.g. all major stakeholders were involved, particularly teachers, parents, and building administrators. This group provided for fine tuning the broad state plan to local requirements by providing for strategic planning and implementation of a building level inclusion plan.

The group was originally formed to provide for planning, but many of the model states maintained some portion of the group after planning was completed to focus on implementation. Like the state groups these local groups provided for problem solving forums, in addition to encouraging the operationalization of the values for inclusion into everyday terms and behavior. Groups that were most effective made sure that teachers and parents alike were welcomed in the group, and felt it to be an open forum for communication.

3. **Forum for discussion of beliefs and assumptions about inclusion.** Interviewees repeatedly talked about attitude problems that acted as barriers to inclusion. The states where inclusion seemed to be the most successful offered a variety of ways for discussing attitudes and beliefs important to inclusion. Some of these included inservice training, co-planning time for teachers, problem solving groups such as the site-based management teams, an atmosphere of open communication generated by the building principal. In other words, attitudes (beliefs/assumptions) seemed to be core to making inclusion work or not work.

Interviewees were specifically questioned extensively about the type of beliefs that would facilitate an inclusion program the most. The following represents a listing of those most frequently mentioned:

- o all students should succeed and there should be strategies and structures that support this goal on an individualized basis,
- o support services should be available to all students experiencing learning difficulties,
- o collaborative teaming between special education and general education is integral to successful inclusion and should be supported and nurtured,
- o inclusion is a basic right for all students,

- o all students can learn; if they're not, it is the teacher's responsibility to find out why and provide for a better learning approach,
- o each child should be considered on an individualized basis,
- o adequate teacher support is a must to make inclusion work,
- o do not caretake students, but rather support them in their learning and provide them with challenges and choices for success.

As indicated in the capsules from the model states, diversity issues were not high on anyone's list of priorities, including the District of Columbia. It is difficult to believe that all five states had no minority students, nor issues that involved gender culture differences that needed to be addressed. Research in diversity indicates that culture is a powerful motivator of daily behavior, and that the prevailing cultural standards act as highly controlling guidelines for behavior that do not recognize or support differences. Unfortunately, this does not recognize that different diverse backgrounds generate different learning needs and expectations of accepted and desired behavior - something to which a successful program for inclusion of students with disabilities must be very sensitive.

4. **Collaborative teams.** The necessity of establishing teams that provided for on-going screening, assessment and remedial instructional suggestions for ALL students experiencing learning problems was repeatedly discussed by those interviewed. Further, a second type of collaborative team was mentioned even more frequently - one where teachers from general and special education, in addition to specialized support personnel worked together in a multidisciplinary fashion to provide for instructional needs within the regular classroom.

If these teams were working well some common elements were present:
(1) intensive training in how to collaborate had been provided,
(2) time for co-planning was provided, and
(3) collaborative teaming was valued by the school administrator and built into teacher evaluation processes.

5. **Adequate support in the general education classroom for inclusion.** Adequate support was defined as:

- o classroom aides,
- o availability of specialist help when needed,
- o reduced class size,
- o provision of training for specific skill needs,
- o provision of a range of teaching materials to provide for individualization of instruction.

None of the 25 plus individuals interviewed over the five model states recommended that all students with disabilities should receive all instruction within the regular classroom. Individuals felt that one-to-one and small group instruction was necessary for certain learning styles where instruction took place away from the activity of the general education class. However, individuals emphasized the importance of keeping students with disabilities in the regular classroom as the first priority, and where specialized instruction was provided within

its confines as much as possible. Consequently, the support indicated above is absolutely essential to maintaining the priority placement as the regular classroom, in addition to coordinating instruction outside of the classroom when necessary.

6. **Involvement of institutions of higher education.** Presently most states indicated non-involvement by their institutions of higher learning. If they were involved, it was frequently through some type of federal funding. Yet, interviewees discussed the lack of teacher skills for inclusion that remained an on-going threat to the viability of an inclusion program. When asked what higher education could do to help, they offered a number of suggestions including the following:

- o provide training in consultation and collaborative teaming,
- o provide training for basic instructional practices that would benefit a diversity of students displaying learning problems such as individualization, curriculum adaptation, behavior control.
- o provide a philosophical base in preservice instruction that indicates a belief in inclusion,
- o provide for a knowledge of systems change and how to manage it,
- o develop effective inclusion models through research and demonstration projects,
- o identify what factors influence student's self-esteem and how best to implement those factors in an instructional setting,
- o help develop an outcome-based curriculum through providing technical assistance to the schools interested in doing this,
- o provide technical assistance to schools in regard to inclusion strategies,
- o establish partnerships between faculty and teachers in the public school system where field-based studies and action research is initiated,
- o provide for inservice training on inclusion,
- o merge training for regular education teachers with special education teachers, and
- o combine more practice with theory at the preservice level of training.

7. **Opportunities for on-going training.** Model states interviewees indicated that all had received some kind of training in inclusion that was fairly intense. However, there was a universal complaint, that state agencies failed to recognize the need for on-going training that addressed new techniques and strategies addressing problems in inclusion programs as they arose. In other words, they indicated a need for training beyond the basics, and more focused on second generation issues as they arose. If this were not provided, frustration was apparent to the degree there was not problem solving or learning forum available.

8. **Peer networks to support collaborative/cooperative learning in the classroom.** Three out of the five model states indicated some type of peer network build that provided for cooperative learning/peer tutoring and a buddy system. Those states that left such a system to change or teacher imagination, were not as successful in consistently establishing a supportive and collegial environment in the classroom for all students to learn.

9. **Learning outcomes clearly defined.** This was a frequently mentioned theme that was desired by many interviewed, but not quite in place. Many states were working on outcome-

based curriculums to address this problem. Two indicated that they were using TQM or some type of individual futures planning to provide for individualized learning outcomes focused on student needs.

A Capsule of West Virginia Now and Its Personnel Practices for Inclusion

The present state of West Virginia's approach to inclusion can be obtained in a global fashion by viewing where it falls in the ranking of states resulting from the need to identify five model states. In the listing provided earlier, West Virginia fell within the middle of that rank order in regard to possessing personnel practices that would best facilitate inclusion for students with disabilities into the regular classroom. A more specific listing of what is present will be discussed in this section.

From the results of the survey, ***highly important personnel practices already in place*** for West Virginia appear to be the following:

1. **For teacher certification practices**: field experience is demanded in both general and special education, in addition to certain required competencies such as behavior management or different learning characteristics of special students,

2. **For administrators certification practices**: a college degree or certification in public school administration is required, in addition to state standards that include required competencies in administration.

3. **For teacher preservice educational background**: teachers indicated the presence of an adequate background in knowing about characteristics of learners and learning styles, in addition to skills in assessment and evaluation.

4. **For administrator preservice educational background:** administrators indicated the presence of an adequate background in principles of curriculum development, development of educational policy, and general management practices important to sound administration of a public school program.

5. **For best teaching practices:** excellence in teaching appears to be defined as individualization to students needs, and learning outcomes appear to be clearly defined for students with and without disabilities.

6. **For administrative best practices**: a vision of education has been developed that is focused on quality educational outcomes for all students, collaborative teams are encouraged, and an overall plan for inclusion has been created.

7. **For teacher inservice practices:** adequate training has been provided in regard to implementation of IEPS and program development for exceptional learners, classroom management skills, ways of promoting student self-actualization and approaches for fostering student collaboration.

8. For administrator inservice practices: training in implementation of IEPs, use of assessment data to plan instruction, development of interpersonal communication skills for working within a multidisciplinary teams, establishing collaborative teams, and managing organizational change has been adequate.

Highly important personnel practices NOT in place according to survey results are the following:

1. **For teacher certification practices**: all important certification practices are in place with one exception; competencies in inclusion should be added to certification requirements.

2. **For administrators certification practices**: a college degree or certification in general education and certification in special education should be added according to the listing of important certification practices facilitating inclusion programs.

3. **For teacher preservice educational background**: teachers indicated the under-representation of preservice educational background in the following areas. These areas of weak skills should be supplemented by inservice training opportunities. Weak preservice skill areas include: planning and managing the teaching/learning environment for maximum learning, communication skills necessary for developing and maintaining collaborative partnerships.

4. **For administrator preservice educational background:** sensitivity to cultural differences may be an under-educated skill area in regard to sensitivity to meeting the needs of future student diversity needs.

5. **For desired characteristics representative of higher education faculty**: West Virginia administrators indicated the following areas to be desired characteristics in higher education institutions that were not necessarily present: some type of field experience by higher education faculty in regard to dealing with inclusion issues, working with the schools on a collaborative basis through providing technical assistance and doing field based action research, and altering the educational preservice curriculum to better provide necessary teacher and administrator skills needed for inclusion.

5. **For best teaching practices:** peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom seems to be not as well represented as desired for the importance of this teaching practice.

6. **For administrative best practices**: intensive training and teacher evaluation systems sensitive to building and maintaining collaborative teams appear to be under-represented for the importance of collaborative team structures, lack of training in leadership skills specific to inclusion programs, and lack of encouragement to examine beliefs about students with disabilities seem to be weak program areas in administrator best practices in West Virginia.

7. **For teacher inservice practices:** inadequate training has been provided in regard to developing interpersonal communication skills for working collaboratively with a multidisciplinary team.

8. For administrator inservice practices: fostering teacher collaboration, re-designing a curriculum for inclusion, supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion, informing and eliciting parent and community support for inclusion, and planning for organization change specific to inclusion appear to be areas that are lacking the intensive training needed for a s successful inclusion program.

9. **Barriers to inclusion mentioned specifically by West Virginia respondents:** barriers mentioned by both administrators and teachers include the following:

a. Ineffective training procedures such as lack of intensive training for teachers in developing and maintaining collaborative teams, lack of knowledge about disability by general education teachers, and separate inservice trainings for general education and special education.

b. Beliefs and attitudes that act as barriers to inclusion that include assumptions by teachers in general education that special students require special teachers, fear by general education teachers in regard to the practicalities of implementing inclusion successfully, turf issues between general and special education, we-they mentality between teachers, lower level administrators, and system administrators especially in regard to special education.

c. Rigid or ineffective school policies and procedures such as certification policies that don't encourage and support inclusion skills, standardized testing requirements, and teacher evaluation systems that do not reward inclusion efforts.

d. Lack of teacher support such as too many teaching duties assigned to carry out inclusion, no teacher aides.

e. Poor leadership strategies such as muddy vision and not clear plan for inclusion perceived by building level educators, feelings of being forced to implement inclusion rather than asked by higher level administrators, and few incentives provided to implement inclusion.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

1. Certain teacher certification practices were rated more highly than others in being able to facilitate inclusion practices. Teacher certification practices rated the most important for inclusion were the following:

a. Standards that required field experience in general education and special education
b. State standards that demand certain required competencies such as behavior management, different learning characteristics of special students, and inclusion strategies.

Most states required the field experience in general education and special education, but less than half of the states required specific competencies focused on students with disabilities.

2. Certain administrator certification practices were identified as being more facilitative of inclusion practices. Administrator certification practices rated as the most important for inclusion were the following:

a. State standards that included required competencies such as knowledge of personnel problems,
b. College degree or certification in public school administration, and
c. Certification or some coursework in special education.
d. College degree or certification in general education (specific to West Virginia only)

Most states required specific competencies in administration in addition to a degree or certification in public school administration. However, only 23 states required certification in special education for an administrator in the public schools, and 28 states required certification in general education. Therefore, these important administrator certification practices for inclusion are not encouraged uniformly across the U.S.

3. Certain teacher preservice education experiences were perceived as being more important to inclusion than others. Specific teacher preservice education areas that were ranked as being most important to inclusion included:

a. planning and managing the teaching/learning environment for maximum learning,
b. knowledge of characteristics of learners such as learning style and theory,
c. communication and collaborative partnerships,
d. assessment and evaluation skills in constructing, giving and interpreting tests (specific to West Virginia as being important).

Teachers indicated that the presence of A and C in their preservice education was less than it should be given the importance of these two areas of knowledge. This was true for both West Virginia teachers and other teachers in the remaining states. Additionally, knowledge of the characteristics of exceptional learners by general education was rated as very important by these teachers, but very much lacking in their preservice education.

4. Certain administrator preservice education experiences were also perceived as more important than others to facilitate inclusion in the public schools. Administrators preservice educational experiences were rated by respondents with the following preservice areas resulting as the most important for inclusion:

a. principles of curriculum development such as curriculum planning, principles for selection and organization of content, current trends in design,
b. social considerations such as cultural differences and beliefs; contemporary social issues, (considered important by administrators from other states other than West Virginia),
c. management practices such as administrative procedures, organizational management, school surveys, personnel problems, school-community relations, student activities,

schedule making, internal financial accounting and supervision.

d. developing educational policy which emphasizes organizational decision processes and policy formation, examination of relationship among educational policy, values and social change (specific to West Virginia administrators in ranking of high importance).

The frequency of exposure to social considerations such as cultural differences and beliefs, in addition to focusing on contemporary social issues in administrators' preservice experience was far less frequent than desired by respondents from all states except West Virginia.

5. Respondents indicated a lack of involvement nationwide on the part of higher education in supporting the inclusion philosophy in schools. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of involvement of higher education in inclusion efforts in their state. The uniform answer in most states was that higher education institutions were not involved to any great degree. However, there was a desire on the part of respondents for this to happen. Certain characteristics were described that would be ideal in regard to skills within higher education faculty that would facilitate inclusion in the public schools. These skills included some of the following:

a. field experience in inclusion programs,
b. ways of working collaboratively with the schools such as providing technical assistance and doing field based studies on inclusion in partnership with teachers in the school system,
c. knowledge expertise in inclusion strategies and approaches,
d. providing information in the human resource development area helpful to inclusion such as understand of cultural diversity, collaboration and consultation skills, effective management of inclusion programs,
e. increased practical applications in preservice educational experiences so that theory is more balanced with required field-based experiences, and
d. establishing more of a collaboration and partnership between special education and general education at the higher education institutional level.

6. Certain teaching practices were designated as the most important best practices for inclusion programs. Best teaching practices were provided to respondents on the survey and they rated these practices for their importance to inclusion. The following strategies were judged to be the most important of all:

a. excellence in teaching is defined as individualization to student needs,
b. peer support networks for students with disabilities in the general education classroom are encouraged,
c. both students with and without disabilities are given opportunities to experience meaningful challenges, to exercise choice, to interact collaboratively with other students, and be actively engaged in academic and interpersonal activities in class and
d. learning outcomes are clearly defined for students at all levels with or without disabilities.

For all teachers, peer support networks were less in evidence in the school systems of the nation than they should be for their ranked importance. For teachers from West Virginia,

practice C - students given opportunities for meaningful challenges and to exercise choice, was less frequently present than it should be for its perceived importance in that state.

Although self-actualization was not among those teaching practices rated as the most important, it was perceived to be of at least medium ranked importance. Unfortunately, the presence of strategies in the school systems of the nation that would address this important aspect of student growth were not present as frequently as they should be.

7. Certain administrative best practices were more important than others for inclusion programs. A listing of administrative best practices for inclusion were provided to survey respondents. The following are rated as the most important of these practices for inclusion:

a. a vision for inclusion,
b. an emphasis on collaborative teams being encouraged,
c. provision of adequate training and support for teachers attempting collaborative teaming,
d. an overall plan for inclusion,
e. leaders being given adequate training in the skills necessary for managing an inclusion program (selected by teachers and not administrators as being important), and
f. schools are encouraged to examine beliefs about students with disabilities (judged to be of great importance by administrators and not teachers).

The presence of these administrative best practices across the nation are less frequent than they should be for best practices C, E, and F.

8. Certain teacher inservice areas are more necessary for inclusion than others. Teacher inservice areas most important to inclusion were the following:

a. implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners,
b. classroom management skills including behavior control,
c. promoting student self-concept/self-actualization,
d. fostering student collaboration (peer tutoring) to promote learning.

The frequency of these inservice topics in general was perceived to be adequate by teachers across the nation.

9. Certain administrator inservice areas were perceived to be more important for skills necessary to inclusion. Important administrator inservice areas for developing necessary skills for inclusion attempts included:

a. developing interpersonal communication skills for working collaboratively on a multidisciplinary team,
b. establishing a multi-disciplinary collaborative team,
c. fostering teacher collaboration,
d. supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion,
e. implementation of IEPs and program development for exceptional learners (specific to

West Virginia administrators),
f. use of assessment data to plan instruction, (specific to WV administrators), and
g. re-designing a curriculum for inclusion (specific to WV administrators).

In regard to opportunity for obtaining inservice training in these areas, topics C, G, and D were not present as frequently as they should be given the importance of these inservice areas to developing adequate skills and knowledge base for inclusion programs.

10. Specific barriers to inclusion were identified by survey respondents. Barriers to inclusion were identified by respondents by reacting to an open ended question asking about this topic. The results of a content analysis indicated the following to be frequently occurring important themes:
a. ineffective training procedures,
b. negative beliefs and attitudes about inclusion,.
c. rigid or ineffective school system policies and processes,
d. lack of teacher support,
e. lack of funding and resources,
f. poor leadership strategies,
g. poor communication,
h. facilities that were not accessible,
i. lack of research about effective inclusion strategies, and
j. ineffective higher education policies and systems.

11. Choice of important personnel practices would not be altered if respondents were only considering students with development disabilities.

12. Specific recommendations resulted from examining five model states. These recommendations included the following:
a. develop a philosophy and plan for inclusion,
b. develop site-based management teams,
c. discuss values and beliefs important to inclusion on an on-going basis,
d. develop and support collaborative teams,
e. provide for adequate teacher support,
f. provide for a continuum of services with the general education class being the priority placement for services,
g. involve higher education,
h. provide for intensive basic and second-generation training,
i. develop peer networks for cooperative learning, and
j. develop clear learning outcomes.

Recommendations for Personnel Practices In West Virginia

1. **Further develop a the philosophy and plan for inclusion so that it includes the following:**
   - o core values and beliefs that are internalized at all levels through on-going discussion,
   - o broad-based desired outcomes for inclusion, e.g., a vision with specific outcomes,
   - o broad-based guidelines for implementation of specified outcomes, and
   - o criteria for judging whether outcomes have been reached.

Involve parents, teachers, community leaders, and system administrators in this additional planning process. Maintain the planning group after implementation to provide for further evolution of the inclusion philosophy and plan as needed.

2. **Provide for site-based management teams or forums that develop a local inclusion philosophy and plan.** Encourage these groups to be on-going to provide for internalization of inclusion values and philosophy into everyday behavior and decision-making, in addition to providing for a forum for discussion, communication, networking and problem solving. Make sure that teachers and parents alike believe that this group is open to regular discussion between them and school administrators. Collaboration and a sense of community should be core to the operation of these groups.

3. **Discuss beliefs and assumptions about inclusion and related topics on an on-going basis.** Attitudes are core to making inclusion work or not work. Since there are many beliefs that are deeply internalized, these will slowly surface over time as specific events evolve. Therefore, there needs to be a forum for dealing with beliefs that arise that are barriers to effective inclusion. Positive beliefs focused on inclusion also need to be discussed in order to determine how to operationalize them on an everyday basis.

Positive beliefs that should be a part of the inclusion philosophy to ensure effective operation include:

- o all students should succeed and there should be strategies and structures that support this goal on an individualized basis,
- o support services should be available to all students experiencing learning difficulties,
- o collaborative teaming between special education and general education is integral to successful inclusion and should be supported and nurtured,
- o inclusion is a basic right for all students,
- o all students can learn; if they're not, it is the teacher's responsibility to find out why and provide for a better learning approach,
- o each child should be considered on an individualized basis,
- o adequate teacher support is a must to make inclusion work,
- o do not caretake students, but rather support them in their learning and provide them with challenges and choices for success.

In addition to the above beliefs, cultural beliefs and assumptions should be explored. The consistent lack of awareness by teachers that were interviewed (white or African-American) indicates cultural assumptions that employ the melting pot concept of adhering to the accepted majority standard. Unfortunately, this does not recognize that different cultural backgrounds generate different learning needs and expectations of accepted and desired behavior.

4. **Develop collaborative teams in each school where inclusion is taking place.** Have a team that provides for screening, testing and suggestions for instruction for all students experiencing learning problems, in addition to a second type which provides for classroom instruction through co-teaching. The latter should consist of teachers in general education and special education, in addition individuals representing necessary support services. Provide these individuals with indepth training in how to collaborate. Support problem solving attempts and provide for time to co-plan and problem solve. Also provide for a teacher evaluation system that will reward those who develop skills in inclusion strategies.

5. **Provide for adequate support in the general education classroom for inclusion.** Interviewees indicated that not all students with disabilities should be provided all instruction within the confines of the general education classroom. A continuum of services should be provided where individualized one-to-one and small group instruction can be provided for those students needing to learn away from the activity of the regular classroom. However, the general education classroom should be the first priority for any instruction offered. To accomplish this, it is essential to provide for adequate support of teachers within the general education classroom. This includes reducing class size when there is a heavy demand for specialized instruction, providing for a range of teaching materials to provide for effective individualization, and providing for classroom aides and specialist when necessary.

6. **Change certification requirements for teachers and administrators to reflect the need for skills and field experiences in inclusion.** For teacher certification requirements include a demand for field experience in inclusion, and training in inclusive teaching strategies such as collaborative teaming. For administrators, require training in how to manage an inclusion program, in addition to certification and coursework in general education and special education.

7. **Get institutions of higher education in the state involved.** Ask institutions of higher learning in the state to participate in the development of inclusion in the state. Encourage them to develop the following strategies whenever possible:

- o provide training in consultation and collaborative teaming,
- o provide training for basic instructional practices that would benefit a diversity of students displaying learning problems such as individualization, curriculum adaptation, cooperative learning..
- o provide a philosophical base in preservice instruction that indicates a belief in inclusion,
- o provide for training in systems change and how to manage it,

- o develop effective inclusion models through research and demonstration projects,
- o identify what factors influence student's self-esteem and how best to implement those factors in an instructional setting,
- o help develop an outcome-based curriculum through providing technical assistance to the schools interested in doing this,
- o provide technical assistance to schools in regard to inclusion strategies,
- o establish partnerships between faculty and teachers in the public school system where field-based studies and action research is initiated,
- o provide for inservice training on inclusion,
- o merge training for regular education teachers with special education teachers, and
- o combine more practice with theory at the preservice level of training.

8. **Provide for on-going training opportunities at the inservice level.** As inclusion practices evolve, additional training and/or problem solving forums need to be provided to address new problems and issues. The list of desired training topics by West Virginia teachers and administrators include the following:

a. planning and managing the teaching/learning environment for maximum learning,
b. developing communication skills necessary for collaborative partnerships,
c. increase sensitivity to cultural differences,
d. provide for indepth leadership training in how to effectively manage an inclusion program,
e. how to foster teacher collaboration as an administrator,
f. re-designing the curriculum for inclusion,
g. supporting and training teachers to handle inclusion at the school building level,
h. eliciting parent and community support for inclusion, planning for organizational change.

9. **Develop peer networks to support collaborative/cooperative learning in the classroom.**

10. **Define learning outcomes clearly among which is an outcome focused on self-actualization of the student with and without disabilities.**

REFERENCES

American Association of College for Teacher Education. (1990). **Teacher education policy in the states: a 50 state survey of legislative and administrative actions**. Washington: DC.

Brown, L., Schwarz. P., Udvari-Solner, A., Frattura Kampschroer, E., Johnson, F., Jorgensen, J., and Gruenewald, L. (1991). How much time should students with severe intellectual disabilities spend in regular education classrooms and elsewhere? **JASH**, 16(1): 1991.

Council for Exceptional Children. (1992). **Common core of knowledge and skills essential for all beginning special education teachers**. Reston, VA.

Davis, S. (1192). **Report card to the nation on inclusion in education of students with mental retardation**. Arlington, TX: The ARC.

Dempsey, S. and Fuchs, D. (1993). "Flat" versus "weighted" reimbursement formulas: a longitudinal analysis of statewide special education funding practices. **Exceptional Children**. 59(5): 433-443.

Fearn, K. (1987). **Report on the status of certification of special educators in the United States and territories.** Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Gartner, A. and Lipsky, D. (1987). Beyond special education: toward a quality system for all students. **Harvard Educational Review**, 57(4).

Heller, H. (1983). Special education and professional standards. **Exceptional Children**, 50(3): 2-28.

Langer, E. (1989). **Mindfulness.** New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Lynch, E. and Hanson, M. (1992). **Developing cross-cultural competence**. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Marockie, H. (1992). **Needs-based formula final recommendations**. Charleston, WV: 1992.

NASBE. (1992). **Winners all: a call for inclusive schools.** Alexandria, VA: The National Association of State Boards of Education.

NASDE. (1989). **State special education finance systems, 1988-1989.** Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc.

Nunn, M. and Lilly, R. (1992). **West Virginia's integrated education initiative**. Charleston, WV: West Virginia Department of Education.

Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured school. **Remedial and Special Education**, 12(6): 8-22.

Skrtic, T. (1991). The Special Education paradox: equity as the way to excellence. **Harvard Educational Review**, 61(2).

Stainback, S. and Stainback, S. (1992). **Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms**. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Stainback, S., Stainback, W., and Jackson, H. (1992). In Stainback and Stainback (eds.) **Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms**. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Villa, R., Thousand, J., Stainback, W., and Stainback, S. (1992). **Restructuring for caring and effective education**. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

This report was published with funding from
the Administration on Developmental Disabilities,
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

West Virginia Developmental Disabilities Planning Council
1601 Kanawha Blvd. West, Suite 200
Charleston, WV 25312
(304) 558-0416 * 558-2376 (TDD) * 558-0941